

Allie Whalen
Access to Moving Image Collections
Rebecca Guenther
Assignment #2
11/14/13

Metadata Mapping Exercise

For this exercise, I will compare MARC, Dublin Core, and PBCore to show the weaknesses and strengths of each standard. The comparison was based on Identifiers, Descriptions, Physical/Technical Information, Legal, and Preservation elements. MARC proved to be a comprehensive standard that oftentimes includes multiple fields for every one field in Dublin Core or PBCore. MARC's strengths include the fields for descriptive metadata, such as Geographic Location, Date (Creation and Release), and Names of Contributors. Throughout this mapping, MARC usually has multiple fields for one general element. For example, the list of contributors includes personal names, corporate names, creation and production credits notes, and participant or performer notes. The high level of granularity in these descriptions, both physical/technical and content-based, are particularly useful for libraries and archives to facilitate access through finding aids. However, the numerous fields available are also a weaknesses and it is oftentimes confusing to decide where the information fits best or if the information should be recorded in all the fields.

Dublin Core is a metadata standard that I am interested in learning more about because of its small number of categories and how it fits information, or does not, into a minimal amount of fields. I found that Dublin Core does limit the amount of information that can be recorded, although at times it seems like the information might be just outside the perimeters of the field. For example, I chose to list source as a possible field to enter generation information. However, the source field only describes information about an item that is a derivative and does not list information about originals. Therefore, there is no field to enter information about first generation items. The biggest weakness of Dublin Core is its limitations, but these limitations are sometimes a strength, particularly for data entry because the fields are more broad and different information can be entered into the same field instead of looking for

separate, more detailed fields. However, broad fields may, in some cases, be helpful to those entering the data but not to those searching for data because of the standard's lack of subfields.

The strengths of PBCore are in the instantiation fields that provide areas to enter more detail about the item. In particular, the instantiation fields, as well as the essence subfields, are useful for entering physical data about an item. For instance, the instantiation fields include dimensions, file size, and tracks and the essence subfields list frame rate, bit depth, and aspect ratio. The attention to physical/technical information shows that PBCore is a useful standard when entering information about moving images. Another strength is PBCore's emphasis on containers and relationships between different fields, and these relationships usually appear in the field's description. However, PBCore does not have a field for preservation action notes and action information is entered into the annotation field instead. Annotation fields are useful for information that does not fit a specific field, but annotations also weaken the finding aid and may hide information that would normally appear if it were categorized into a field.