

Re: Hard Disk Partition Problem

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2007-08/msg04152.html>

- *From:* "Gerry" <gerry@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 19 Aug 2007 07:01:10 +0100
-

Ken

The counter argument as you know on separate pagefiles.

How to configure paging files for optimization and recovery in Windows XP

<http://support.microsoft.com/kb/314482/en-us>

--

Regards.

Gerry

~~~~

FCA

Stourport, England

Enquire, plan and execute

~~~~~

Ken Blake, MVP wrote:

On Sat, 18 Aug 2007 14:32:01 -0700, T5 <T5@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I myself don't know that why i created 8 drives. Can you please point me in the right direction in this matter. Actually i had 4 drives in my old computer which have 40GB HD . i thought creating more drives is better for larger hard drives!.

No, it's certainly not automatically "better." In general, partitions are an organizational structure and it's up to you as to how you want to organize your drive. We don't all *have to* do it the same way.

But you certainly shouldn't create some number of drives haphazardly. How many to have should be part of a rational plan, and that plan

Re: Hard Disk Partition Problem

should include knowing what you plan to put on each partition, and making sure that there's a sound technical basis for each separation. Just partitioning into x drives and randomly putting files on whatever drive you think of makes no sense.

Here are some general thoughts on how to partition:

I think many people over-partition, but that doesn't mean it's always bad to have more than one partition. My view is that most people's partitioning scheme should be based on their backup scheme. If, for example, you backup by creating a clone or image of the entire drive, then a single partition might be best. If, on the other hand, you backup only your data, then the backup process is facilitated by having all data in a separate partition.

Except for those running multiple operating systems, there is seldom any benefit to having more than two partitions. Note the word "seldom" rather than "never." I'm sure there are many exceptions.

Some people make a separate partition for installed programs, because they think that separating programs from Windows will let them reinstall Windows and keep their installed programs. That's false, since all installed programs (except for an occasional trivial one) have pointers to them within Windows, in the registry and elsewhere. So if Windows goes, the pointers go with it. Since programs have to be reinstalled if Windows does, this rationale for a separate partition for programs doesn't work.

Some people erroneously think that having the page file on a separate partition will improve performance. That of course is also false; it hurts performance, because it increases head movement to get back and forth from the page file to the other frequently-used data on the drive.

Some people make a separate partition to store backups of their other partition(s). People who rely on such a "backup" are just kidding themselves. It's only very slightly better than no backup at all, because it leaves you susceptible to simultaneous loss of the original and backup to many of the most common dangers: head crashes and other kinds of drive failure, severe power glitches, nearby lightning strikes, virus attacks, even theft of the computer. In my view, secure backup needs to be on removable media, and not kept in the computer.

Separating different kinds of files on partitions is an organizational technique, but so is separating different kinds of files in folders. The difference is that partitions are static and fixed in size (their size can only be changed with special third-party software), while folders are dynamic, changing size automatically as necessary to meet your changing needs. That generally makes folders a much better way to organize, in my view.

Re: Hard Disk Partition Problem

What frequently happens when people organize with partitions instead of folders is that they miscalculate how much room they need on each such partition, and then when they run out of room on the partition where a file logically belongs, while still having lots of space left on the other, they simply store the file in the "wrong" partition. Paradoxically, therefore, that kind of partition structure results in *less* organization rather than more.

"Ken Blake, MVP" wrote:

On Sat, 18 Aug 2007 11:48:06 -0700, T5
<T5@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I am new here. This is my first post. I am having problem with my HD space. My HD is 320 GB Western Digital SATA-II. I have partitioned it using Windows XP Installation Setup. I have created 40 GB each drive. The problem is that last drive shows only 18 GB of Total Capacity instead of 40 GB. Where is the rest 22 GB?

There is no other 22GB. Actually you don't have a 320GB drive. You have a 298GB drive, like everyone else who has what's *called* a 320GB drive.

All hard drive manufacturers define 1GB as 1,000,000,000 bytes, while the rest of the computer world, including Windows, defines it as 2 to the 30th power (1,073,741,824) bytes. So a 320 billion byte drive is actually a little under 298GB. Some people point out that the official international standard defines the "G" of GB as

Re: Hard Disk Partition Problem

one billion, not 1,073,741,824. Correct though they are, using the binary value of GB is so well established in the computer world that I consider using the decimal value of a billion to be deceptive marketing.

But let me also address another question. You are partitioning a 320GB drive into *eight* different partitions. May I ask why? It seems like enormous overkill to me, and I suspect that your decision to do that is based on misunderstandings of how things work. Please explain what you plan to use each of the eight partitions for.

Almost everyone who is not booting multiple operating systems is best off with no more than two partitions—one for Windows and applications, the other for data. More than two is generally a needless complication, and makes things worse, not better.

—
Ken Blake, Microsoft MVP Windows – Shell/User
Please Reply to the Newsgroup