

The Contracting World of Cutter's Expansive Classification

R. Conrad Winke

At the centenary of Charles Ammi Cutter's death, his Expansive Classification (EC) is still the primary scheme used in four libraries, while twenty-three others continue to maintain some portion of their collections in EC. In this study, fifty-seven libraries in the United States, Canada, and England have been identified as past or present EC users. Dates of their adoption and, if applicable, abandonment of the scheme are provided. Of the libraries where EC is a legacy scheme, the reasons for abandonment were sought, as well as determining the type of classification to which the library had moved to and whether EC was still employed for certain materials, or whether reclassification had been completed. Librarians at the four libraries still using EC as their primary scheme were interviewed about how revisions are made to the schedules and the practicality of remaining an EC institution.

Library pioneer Charles Ammi Cutter (1837–1903) has cast a long shadow on the field of cataloging and classification.¹ Born in Boston, Massachusetts, March 14, 1837, he graduated from Harvard College in 1855 and from Harvard Divinity School in 1859. While attending the latter institution, he was appointed school librarian. During his time there, he participated in the preparation of a new manuscript catalog of the school's collection, while also undertaking the rearrangement and reclassification of the collection. After graduation, he decided not to be ordained and instead was appointed assistant librarian in the Harvard libraries, where he assisted the head cataloger from 1860 to 1868. His greatest accomplishment while at Harvard was developing a proposal for a new catalog that was to be based on cards rather than printed books. The catalog was to be divided into two sections, an author file and an alphabetically classed file. This project provided the experience for his later work with dictionary catalogs.

In 1868, Cutter was elected librarian of the Boston Athenaeum where he was again confronted with the need to prepare a new library catalog. This was issued in book form between 1874 and 1882 and represents the first major modern dictionary catalog and, as such, was the first of Cutter's major contributions to library science. In order to prepare this catalog, Cutter wrote his *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue*.² This publication was incorporated into the United States Bureau of Education's *Public Libraries in the United States of America: Their History, Condition, and Management* the following year.³ It was later reissued in three revised editions, the fourth edition of which was made applicable to card as well as printed-book format. The rules include sections on the choice and form of catalog entries, descriptive cataloging, and subject entries. This code, Cutter's second major contribution, has influenced all subsequent modern codes and also served as the basis for development of two major American subject thesauri—the Library of Congress Subject Headings and the Sear's List of Subject Headings. During his time at the Boston Athenaeum,

R. Conrad Winke (cwinke@colum.edu) is Head of Technical Services, Columbia College Chicago Library.

Cutter developed what was to become his third major contribution, his Expansive Classification (EC), the topic of this paper.

In 1893, Cutter resigned from the Athenaeum to accept a position at the newly founded Forbes Library in Northampton, Massachusetts. In this position, Cutter experimented with his own theories of public library administration and service. He endeavored to create a library that circulated, to the broadest audience possible, not only books, but music and pictures as well. While there, he also developed innovative extension and exchange programs. In addition to these accomplishments, Cutter was the author of numerous articles dealing with library science, the editor of a number of professional journals, and one of the original founders of the American Library Association in 1876. He passed away while on a trip with his wife on September 6, 1903, in Walpole, New Hampshire.

Expansive Classification

When Cutter began working at the Athenaeum, the library was using a fixed location for shelving its materials. Because it had open stacks, using a classification scheme would enable browsing of the shelves. Cutter had originally intended to use Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), but later decided to create his own scheme using a broader notation to express the classes. As originally devised, EC was tailored for the Athenaeum's collection of 100,000 titles and utilized a numeric/alphabetic notation. This notation appeared to hinder a broader acceptance of the scheme. Cutter then devised a different, strictly alphabetic notation, which was applied to the collection of the Cary Library in Lexington, Massachusetts. This proved successful, and Cutter received many requests from librarians wishing to apply the Athenaeum classification with the Lexington notation in their libraries. Because of this, Cutter decided to create a scheme that would be suitable for a library of any size.

Thus EC consisted of seven expansions with increasing levels of specificity. The theory was that the first expansion would be used by very small libraries, while the seventh by the world's largest collections. Because each expansion was an outgrowth of the one before it, as a library's collection grew in size the library could move from one expansion to the next without needing to reclassify its older materials. This was in sharp contrast to DDC, which provides for broad classification by permitting classifiers to abridge full numbers logically and thereby create more general notations. Because of its strictly alphabetic notation—which used up to four letters per class, permitting therefore a total of 367,280 possible subject areas—it was both accommodating of new subjects and economical in notation. Within

a given EC class, individual titles were distinguished from each other by alphanumeric author marks, which were arranged in tables as a part of EC. This was the first incarnation of what today are commonly referred to as Cutter numbers and Cutter tables. This is the only portion of EC that remains in general use.

Cutter published schedules for the first six expansions from 1891 through 1893. Portions of the seventh expansion were published from 1896 through 1911, but Cutter was to die before finishing work on it, including most notably the technology section. In its day, EC was generally regarded as one of the most logical and scholarly of American classification schemes. Its greatest influence, perhaps, is that although it was not adopted by the Library of Congress (LC), the LC classification was modeled after EC, and EC was used to develop LC's "Class Z: Bibliography and Library Science," which served as the outline for the remaining schedules in that system. Unfortunately, Cutter did not actively promote his classification and made no provisions for its continued revision and publication after his death. A contemporary library science pioneer, Melvil Dewey (1851–1931), aggressively marketed his DDC and established the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation to ensure its ongoing revision and publication. Today, DDC is the most widely used library classification system in the world, having gone through twenty-two editions, with translations in more than thirty languages and employment in more than 135 countries. EC, despite its early promise, remains barely a footnote in the history of modern classification.⁴

The history of descriptive cataloging rules and the evolution of the modern library catalog, as well as Cutter's influence on them, have been well documented in the literature. The story of EC, however, has been largely overlooked, leaving a gap in both the history of classification and the contributions of Cutter to the field. Certainly, the demise of a classification system as widespread as EC and the stranding of libraries with a defunct method of arranging their collections are not every day phenomena and therefore deserve documentation.

Robert L. Mowery was the last person to publish any research on EC. From 1971 to 1973, he surveyed the classification practices of sixty-seven American, Canadian, and British libraries that had been identified as potentially having once used EC to arrange their collections. At that time, he found that twelve libraries in the United States and Canada were still using EC as their primary classification, while at least three others continued to make some use of the scheme for portions of their collections.⁵

With that in mind, the goal of this current study was to present an update on the history of EC over the last quarter century. More specifically, it sought to determine if any of the libraries in Mowery's study were still using EC today,

and if so, what compelled them to remain an EC library, what methods they employed in updating the schedules, and what sort of staff and user training issues existed. For the libraries that had abandoned EC, this study sought to determine when the decision to leave EC was made and why, which scheme had been adopted in its place if the collection had been completely reclassified, and, if not, whether EC was fully a legacy scheme or still being used for some classes of materials. Additionally, this study sought to locate as many former users of EC as possible in order to determine which libraries had historically used EC, which classification schemes had been adopted when EC was abandoned, and whether any of them continued to have some portions of their collections classified in EC.

Method

Librarians from each of the twelve institutions that had been using EC at the time of Mowery's study were interviewed by telephone during 2001–2002 to determine the current situation in their libraries. Because one of these institutions, the National Museums of Canada, had ceased to exist and its functions, as well as its library collections, had been absorbed by four other bodies, fifteen interviews were conducted in total. An in-person interview with Robert Mowery was conducted on November 15, 2002. He passed along his considerable archive of Cutter-related research materials, including all his original correspondence with the sixty-seven libraries of his study. From this pool of institutions, librarians were interviewed by telephone on an as-needed basis to ascertain what classification system was currently employed at their institution, whether their institutions continued to make some use of EC or maintain some portion of their collections in EC, and, if so, whether reclassification was planned or under way. While an inquiry on AUTOCAT (an electronic cataloging discussion group accessible over the Internet) regarding current or former EC libraries failed to yield any institutions not already covered by Mowery's research, an 1893 survey conducted for the World's Library Congress did identify two further past users of the scheme.⁶

Findings

Fifty-seven libraries in the United States, Canada, and England have been identified as past or present EC users (see appendix), with fifty-four libraries having adopted EC as their primary classification at some point in their history. William Parker Cutter, Cutter's nephew and biographer, claimed that the system had been adopted in about one hundred American libraries, although he did not enumer-

ate which ones, so it is possible that other libraries might have been eligible for inclusion in this study.⁷ While the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts, continues to use a classification scheme based on EC, it has been so heavily modified that it is more properly regarded as a locally devised scheme.

In his 1976 study, Mowery contacted sixty-seven libraries, not all of which were in fact users of EC. Ambiguous wording in that article has unfortunately led other authors to misinterpret this figure to mean the total number of libraries that had at some point adopted the scheme, most notably Arlene G. Taylor in *Wynar's Introduction to Cataloging and Classification*.⁸ Generally speaking, libraries that had adopted EC had done so by the turn of the last century, and no libraries adopted the scheme after the 1920s. Ironically, by this time, a number of libraries had already abandoned EC! By type, EC libraries included twenty-four public libraries (42 percent), fifteen academic libraries (26 percent), eight government libraries (14 percent), eight athenaeums (14 percent), and two theological libraries (4 percent). Geographically, EC was adopted by three libraries in England (5 percent), thirteen in Canada (23 percent), and forty-one in the United States (72 percent).

Four institutions continue to make use of EC as their primary classification scheme today. Not surprisingly, all of the fifty-three libraries that abandoned EC switched to either DDC or Library of Congress Classification (LCC), the most popular schemes in the three home countries. DDC was chosen by twenty-five libraries (47 percent), of which twenty-three (92 percent) are public libraries. LCC was chosen by the remaining twenty-eight institutions (53 percent). With the exception of Smith College, which first switched to DDC and only reclassified a second time to LCC in 1971, all of the academic libraries converted to LCC. This bears out the generally held notion that public libraries prefer DDC while academic libraries prefer LCC. The three British libraries chose DDC, in line with the popularity that that scheme enjoys in Great Britain. Of the fifty-three former EC libraries, thirty (57 percent) have fully reclassified their collections to their new primary scheme, while twenty-three (43 percent) still have some portion of their collections classed in EC. As might be expected, the amount of materials remaining in EC varies widely from one library to the next. Some institutions, such as the Watertown Free Public Library in Watertown, Massachusetts, have only a few thousand titles still in EC, while others, such as the Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois, continue to have the vast majority of their collections in EC. A number of these collections have either not been retrospectively converted or are housed apart from the general collections. Of these libraries with legacy EC collections, about half have reclassification projects either

planned or under way, while the other half have no active plans to reclassify the EC portions of their collections at the present time.

Finally, five libraries are still adding materials to some portion of their EC collections, although it is not their primary scheme any longer. Both the Canadian Museum of Nature Library and the Geological Survey of Canada Library in Ottawa, Ontario, continue to classify serials in EC, with the former using it for all titles and the latter using it only for those titles cataloged prior to the scheme's abandonment. The Newberry Library adds continuations to its EC collections while the Westfield Athenaeum in Westfield, Massachusetts, and the Berkshire Athenaeum in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, still make use of EC for local history. The Newton Free Library in Newton, Massachusetts, continues to classify biographies in EC's "E" class, although they use only the letter "E" followed by a Cutter author number for the biographee. As such, this cannot really be considered any different than libraries that use a similar technique of "B" followed by a Cutter author notation for the biographee and, in reality, is not a true use of EC.

Any time a library has collections split among different classification schemes, problems can arise in acclimating both staff and users to their differences. Nearly all the librarians interviewed who worked in a split collection reported some level of difficulty with the situation. One method that libraries, especially those with relatively few titles remaining in EC, have used to mitigate confusion is to move the EC collection into staff areas of the library, such as technical services. This is the method both the Redwood Library and Athenaeum in Newport, Rhode Island, and the Watertown Free Public Library have adopted. Other libraries, such as the Westfield Athenaeum, house their EC collection in separate rooms or, like the University of Wisconsin Memorial Library in Madison, at least identify an item's location as "Cutter Collection." At the Newberry Library, the entire collection is closed stack, thereby eliminating patron confusion, since the notation for the "address" of the book they are paging is typically of little concern to them. Librarians working in collections that opted to move to LCC also reported confusion due to the similarity of notation between the two schemes.

Librarians at eighteen institutions, either via telephone interviews or from Mowery's correspondence, were able to provide their institution's reasons for abandoning EC. These were broken down into three general categories. By far, the most frequently cited reason was the lack of coordinated revision of the schedules. None of the libraries surveyed, be they past or present users of EC, had ever worked in conjunction with another library on schedule revisions or sharing call numbers. Therefore, all updates to the scheme had to be carried out in house, a time-consuming and costly undertaking. A number of librarians mentioned the fact

that the schedules themselves had long been out of print and replacement volumes could not be obtained. Thus, over time, the print schedules that the library did have became dense with marginalia and overstuffed with revised schemes being clipped in. Wear and tear, especially on such heavily used books, was also cited as a problem. Although no one specifically mentioned it, it would seem probable that as the size of catalog departments grew over time, the fixed number of printed schedules available to a larger number of staff members would have been inconvenient. Finally, one librarian cited that in some portions of the schedules all the numbers had been used up, but the topic itself was continuing to expand, leading to a crisis in devising further notation.

In addition to the above-mentioned reasons, libraries that waited until the 1970s and 1980s to convert tended to cite automation and the resource-sharing opportunities brought about by cooperative cataloging as their primary motivator. Although the MARC format can accommodate EC notation, which is placed in MARC field 084\$a and identified by the source code "cutterec" in 084\$b2, very few records on OCLC contain this type of class number, whereas LCC and DDC numbers appear quite regularly in online copy. However, even if EC numbers did occur with some regularity, because the EC libraries did their own revisions in house and not in conjunction with each other, EC numbers in MARC records would not be able to be shared between libraries with the same facility that LCC and DDC numbers are. Automation also brought about the demise of the card catalog and with it the need to pull, remark, and refile card sets that would have been necessary for a reclassification project undertaken in a manual environment. Finally, reclassification was brought about in some institutions due to changes in governance, such as the already mentioned case of the National Museums of Canada Library, which was disbanded and divided among four other libraries. At the St. Louis Mercantile Library in St. Louis, Missouri, affiliation with the University of Missouri made switching to LCC a logical move so that all the collections would be classed in one (currently updated) system. The predecessor body of Andover-Harvard Theological Seminary Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts, switched to LCC when it merged with Harvard University.

EC in Use Today

As of 2002, EC remains the primary classification scheme in four libraries: Charleston Library Society, Charleston, South Carolina; Forbes Library, Northampton, Massachusetts; Holyoke Public Library, Holyoke, Massachusetts; and Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield, Illinois. The size of these collections ranges from 70,000 volumes

(Holyoke) to 225,000 volumes (Forbes). None has any plans to abandon the scheme in the foreseeable future. Because each of the four institutions deals with EC in house and no joint cooperation exists between them for expansion or revision of the classification, each will be treated independently.

Charleston Library Society

Assistant Librarian LeeAnn Floss has worked at the Charleston Library Society since 1988. Until that time, catalogers were still using the original EC books. Any changes made to the schedules were first discussed and then annotations were made accordingly. Around this time, a major refurbishment to the system was carried out, which included revising portions of the tables and flushing out definitions of some of the notation. There was also a minor amount of relocation of topics. The original schedules were then retyped and the original books ceased to be used. Only minor changes have been made since then. Floss believes that librarians are content with the scheme, while patrons are as confused by it as they are by any other classification notation.

Forbes Library

Cutter worked at the Forbes Library from 1894 until his death, and it was he who implemented the use of EC there. Because of this, there is a sense of pride and tradition in remaining an EC library, according to Blaise Bisailon, the library's director. Reclassifying was seriously discussed a decade ago, but it was determined that the costs involved in reclassifying a quarter million items would be too high, and that a split collection was not desirable. Therefore, Forbes will remain an EC library for the foreseeable future. Everything is classed in EC at the library, including video-recordings. All revisions to the schedules are carried on in house, with new topics being integrated on an as-needed basis. Occasionally there is some alteration to the notation or movement of subjects as views on topics change. These decisions are made by the one cataloger on staff, who works completely autonomously. The schedules themselves are now transferred to a word processing system and updated. Prior to this, notes had been added to the old print schedules. Overall, the scheme works well for Forbes, and the librarians like the flexibility they have in altering the schedules on their own. Users are at times baffled, but no more so than with any classification scheme.

Illinois State Historical Library

The Illinois State Historical Library is run by the State of Illinois and is primarily concerned with collecting history, with a focus on Illinois history. Two catalogers are currently employed there, one for over thirty years. Because of the

nature of the collection, states Jane Ehrenhart, the head of technical services, the catalogers try to approach the materials from a geographic point of view, which can typically be readily accommodated by the existing EC schedules. However, some areas of the scheme have been expanded, and the staff does update the schedules as needed, typically in consultation with each other. While some staff would prefer to use a different classification scheme, it is unlikely that funding from the state would be made for such a project. Therefore the library will continue with EC for the foreseeable future. Because the library is closed stack, there are no real problems with training patrons how to use EC.

Holyoke Public Library

Maria Pagan, director, cites a number of factors at Holyoke Public Library that account for EC's continued support. The library has had the same cataloger for more than thirty years and, as might be expected, she is extremely familiar with the scheme. As needed, she will integrate new notations to the classification, although the general policy is to classify materials into already existing numbers for the sake of simplicity. When new topics are needed, numbers are created in consultation with both the head librarian and, interestingly, the catalog of the Forbes Library. At the moment, the cataloger is still working with the original print versions of the schedules, which are now brittle and extremely fragile. Plans are under way to scan them. Although LCC is already used for the children's collection, no plans are currently in place to convert the general collection to another classification scheme, which would be very time consuming. In addition, the library automated only two years ago. In general, the staff find EC easy to use, and, because the system is not complicated, training staff and patrons how to use it is not difficult.

Conclusions

The EC soldiers on tenaciously at the centenary of Cutter's death and shows no sign of totally disappearing at any time in the near future. Although most of its original adherents have since come to abandon it, the enormous commitments of time and resources at a number of institutions with large collections essentially make total reclassification an unfeasible undertaking. And of the libraries actively using and maintaining the scheme, the Forbes Library is imbued with pride in its institutional history and has no interest in leaving the scheme, while the others appear to be committed users at least for the near future. A number of these institutions have catalogers with decades of tenure, however, and it is conceivable that as they retire, their replacements might not prove to be the EC enthusiasts that they are.

Nevertheless, it appears likely that EC will be around for many years to come in some manner.

Perhaps more important, however, is that the story of EC serves as a cautionary tale of the unfortunate consequences of librarians not working together cooperatively. Most librarians would rather utilize a classification scheme that they can be sure will remain in print and up to date. Despite the fact that in its day, EC was commonly regarded as superior to DDC, Cutter's failure to provide for the continuing revision, expansion, and publication of his work essentially assured its demise. He failed to aggressively market his classification, which, had it been implemented in more institutions (especially had the Library of Congress adopted it), might have ensured its survival. However, EC still might have been salvageable in the immediate years after Cutter's passing had the librarians using the scheme at the time banded together and worked cooperatively at maintaining the schedules, as happened with Henry Evelyn Bliss' Bibliographic Classification, now maintained by the Bliss Classification Association and still in use in a number of libraries in Great Britain. Instead, librarians at EC libraries seemingly did not pursue working together, but worked on their own until, in all but four cases, this became impractical and they abandoned it.

Reference

1. "Cutter, Charles Ammi," in *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science* (New York: Marcel Dekker, 1968), 6: 380–87. This article serves as the source of the biographical information about Cutter presented in the introductory section of this paper.
2. Charles A. Cutter, *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue* (Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1875).
3. U.S. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States of America: Their History, Condition, and Management* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1876).
4. Melvil Dewey et al., *Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index* (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC, 2003).
5. Robert L. Mowery, "The Cutter Classification: Still at Work," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 20, no. 2: 154–56.
6. U.S. Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commissioner of Education made to the Secretary of the Interior for the year 1892/1893 with accompanying papers* (Washington, D.C.: Govt. Print. Off., 1892–93).
7. William Parker Cutter, *Charles Ammi Cutter* (Chicago: ALA, 1931), 44.
8. Arlene G. Taylor, *Wynar's Introduction to Cataloging and Classification* (Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 2000).

Appendix Summary of Findings

Library ¹	Type ²	Date adopted EC	Still using EC?	New class	Date change was made	Fully re-classified?	Reclass planned or underway?	EC active or legacy? ³
Alberta Provincial Library, Edmonton, AB ⁴	G	1907	N	LCC	1959	Y		
Amesbury Public Library, Amesbury, MA	P	1903	N	DDC	1946	Y		
Andover-Harvard Theological Seminary Library, Cambridge, MA	T	ca. 1908	N	LCC	1971	Y		
Andover-Newton Theological Seminary Library, Newton Center, MA	T	ca. 1895	N	LCC	1971	N	N	L
Berkshire Athenaeum, Pittsfield, MA	A	1898	N	DDC	1936	N	N	A ⁵
Bootle Public Library, Lancashire, England	P	ca. 1900	N	DDC	1929	Y		
<i>Boston Athanaeum, Boston, MA</i>	A	ca. 1879	N	LCC	1978	N	Y	L
Brown University Library, Providence, RI	U	1893	N	LCC	1923	N	N	L
Cambridge Public Library, Cambridge, MA	P	by 1893	N	DDC	by 1920s	Y		
<i>Canada Science and Technology Museum Library, Ottawa, ON⁶</i>	G	1911	N	LCC	1990	N	Y	L
<i>Canadian Museum of Civilization Library, Ottawa, ON⁷</i>	G	1911	N	LCC	1990	N	Y	L

Library ¹	Type ²	Date adopted EC	Still using EC?	New class	Date change was made	Fully re-classified?	Reclass planned or underway?	EC active or legacy?
<i>Canadian Museum of Nature Library, Ottawa, ON</i> ⁸	G	1911	N	LCC	1978	N	N	A ⁹
Cary Memorial Library, Lexington, MA	P	1888	N	DDC	1962	Y		
<i>Charleston Library Society, Charleston, SC</i>	A	ca. 1899	Y					
Chelmsford Public Library, Essex, England	P	1906	N	DDC	1924	Y		
District of Columbia Public Library, Washington, DC	P	by 1900	N	DDC	1947	N	N	L
<i>Forbes Library, Northampton, MA</i>	P	1894	Y					
Fort Worth Public Library, Fort Worth, TX	P	1901	N	DDC	1938	Y		
<i>Geological Survey of Canada Library, Ottawa, ON</i> ¹⁰	G	1911	N	LCC	1979	N	Y	A ¹¹
George Washington University, Washington, DC	U	1897/98	N	LCC	1940/41	Y		
Helena Public Library, Helena, MT ¹²	P	unknown	N	DDC	1960	Y		
<i>Holyoke Public Library, Holyoke, MA</i>	P	ca. 1900	Y					
Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield, IL	G	ca. 1900	Y					
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, IL	U	ca. 1901	N	LCC	1954	Y		
Manchester City Library, Manchester, NH	P	1890	N	DDC	1961	Y		
McGill University Library, Montreal, QC	U	1896	N	LCC	1967	N	N	L
Medford Public Library, Medford, MA	P	ca. 1895	N	DDC	1969 ¹³	N	N	L
Memphis Public Library, Memphis, TN	P	ca. 1900	N	DDC	1927	Y		
Milwaukee-Downer College Library, Milwaukee, WI ¹⁴	U	by 1920	N	LCC	late '30s/early '40s	Y		
Minnesota Historical Society Library, St. Paul, MN	A	ca. 1905	N	LCC	1915	N	Y	L
Montreal City Library, Montreal, QC	P	1917	N	DDC	1930	Y		
Mount Holyoke College Library, South Hadley, MA	U	1901	N	LCC	1966 ¹⁵	N	N	L
<i>National Gallery of Canada Library, Ottawa, ON</i> ¹⁶	G	1911	N	LCC	1990	Y		
Newberry Library, Chicago, IL	A	1895	N	LCC	1977	N	N	A ¹⁷
Newton Free Library, Newton, MA	P	1901	N	DDC ¹⁸	1958	Y		
North Abington Public Library, North Abington, MA ¹⁹	P	1904	N	DDC	by 1977	N		
Ottawa Public Library, Ottawa, ON	P	1905	N	DDC	1964	Y		
Peabody Institute, Peabody, MA	U	1871	N	LCC	1937	Y		
<i>Presbyterian College Library, Montreal, QC</i>	U	unknown	N	LCC	1980s	N	N	L
<i>Redwood Library and Athenaeum, Newport, RI</i>	A	1889	N	LCC	1994	N	N	L
Research Council of Alberta Library, Edmonton, AB ²⁰	U	1921	N	LCC	1952	Y		
Rosenberg Library, Galveston, TX	P	1904	N	DDC	1956	N	Y	L
Smith College, Northampton, MA	U	ca. 1900	N	DDC ²¹	1909	Y		

Library ¹	Type ²	Date adopted EC	Still using EC?	New class	Date change was made	Fully re-classed?	Reclass planned or underway?	EC active or legacy?
Springfield City Library, Springfield, MA	P	1899	N	DDC	1902	N	Y	L
St. George-the-Martyr Library, Southwark, London, England ²²	P	1900/01	N	DDC	by 1910	Y		
<i>St. Louis Mercantile Library, St. Louis, MO</i>	A	1892	N	LCC	early 1990s	N	Y	L
State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, WI	G	1897	N	LCC	1966	Y		
University of Alberta Library, Edmonton, AB	U	1909	N	LCC	1952	Y		
University of South Carolina Library, Columbia, SC	U	1898	N	LCC	1938	Y		
University of Wisconsin Memorial Library, Madison, WI	U	1893	N	LCC	1954	N	Y	L
Watertown Free Public Library, Watertown, MA	P	1900	N	LCC/DC	mid 1970s	N	Y	L
Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT	U	1893	N	LCC	1968	N	Y	L
<i>Westfield Athenaeum, Westfield, MA</i>	A	1900	N	DDC	1988	N	N	A ²³
Westmount Public Library, Westmount, QC	P	1899	N	DDC	ca. 1946	Y		
Williams College Library, Williamstown, MA	U	unknown	N	LCC	1930s	Y		
Winchester Town Library, Winchester, MA	P	1879	N	DDC	1892	Y		
Woods Memorial Library, Barre, MA	P	1895	N	DDC	1939 ²⁴	Y		

1. Names appearing in italics are the institutions mentioned in Mowery's study.
2. A=atheneum, G=government library, P=public library, T=theological library, U=academic library
3. A=active, L=legacy
4. Now known as the Legislature Library, Legislative Assembly of Alberta
5. Local history still in EC
6. Formerly part of the National Museums of Canada Library
7. Formerly part of the National Museums of Canada Library
8. Formerly part of the National Museums of Canada Library
9. EC still used for serials and older books
10. Operated jointly with the National Museums of Canada Library prior to 1959
11. EC still used for journals
12. Now known as the Lewis and Clark Library
13. DDC adapted for most subjects circa 1935; literature, history, and several other subjects still classed by EC until 1969
14. Now Lawrence University, Appleton, Wisconsin; was using EC at the time of the 1920/1922 ALA Survey of Libraries
15. LC adopted for the sciences circa 1937
16. Formerly part of the National Museums of Canada Library
17. Continuations still classed in EC
18. Still uses EC class "E" for biographies, with call numbers constructed as "E" + Cutter author table number for biographee
19. Now called the Abington Public Library
20. Established by the Province of Alberta in 1921; housed and administered by the University of Alberta until 1964; since 1999, a not-for-profit corporation
21. Switched to LC in 1971; at that time DDC still being used for rare books and EC for scores
22. Now part of the Borough of Southwark Library, Southwark, London, England
23. EC used for local history
24. EC used for biographies until 1967