

In one of the references I used for creating this data map, it was noted in the <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/june06/chan/06chan.html> article about how some of the *Issues in Cross walking Content Metadata Standards* included “a semantic definition of each metadata element, whether or not a metadata element is mandatory, optional or mandatory based on certain conditions, or whether or not a metadata element may occur multiple times in the same records.” This was the very issue that I experienced when using MARC. Many of these terms would essentially be repeated. In one sense, it was good having these fields be repeated within the index because then describing the item was not only clearer to categorize, but also developed a broader perspective on how to categorize the item in general. For example, with moving images the field that refers to genre, the field is specific (with 655), but is also can be added as a note (500). A lot of information can be recorded, but also completely lost because of the amount of information MARC has. In a general term such as “Geographic Location”, MARC has fields referring to a geographic area code of production, the actual physical location of where the film is, and what geographic content is shown in the film. While mapping MARC I decided to just have each term have its own cell in the spreadsheet just so I can keep track of them. Each of them all refers to the same general field name, but they are just under different subfields and categories. And only the numbers with text (# or \$) are the fields used in MARC. The information within parenthesis is just my notes in order to understand what the field names were.

Now I could also have added MODS information in separate cells, but because of its visual layout, it wouldn't have worked out doing this in an excel sheet. MODS is the standard I personally was able to understand the most because it is organized in XML

format. After the initial terror of seeing all the fields running down the page, it is very simple to follow and see where the coding would start and end. However, I feel for many people this may be an issue or a weakness because it is not in a format that people can easily read. You do have to search within the brackets and categories to actually find the information you need. MODS is the medium between MARC and Dublin Core where it is less detailed than MARC but richer than DC. One of the issues I saw was that (which in reality may not even be an issue) there were no mandatory elements that make up MODS. There are suggested elements indicated in the [DLF/Aquifer Summary of Requirements and Recommendations](#), but to create a MODS record you just need at least one element. And compared to the leader information given in MARC, the moving image field is very limited to topics that are commonly used. For example, MARC notes in Leader 6 “g” at “Projected medium”. MODS doesn’t have an equivalent for this. Nor does it take into account digital works that are projected via multimedia systems such as computers.

But both are better than the information output Dublin Core provides. Even though Dublin Core was the most “simplified” of the three standards, it was difficult to chart, especially when compared to other standards such as MARC and MODS. Its biggest benefit (which coincidentally for me was also its biggest weakness) is that there are only 15 elements within Dublin Core. These elements can literally be listed: title, creator, subject, description, publisher, contributor, date, type, format, identifier, source, language, relation, coverage and rights. There are some categories where this proved beneficial such as “generation” under physical/technical info because the assumption of what “generation” refers to depends on its relation to this subcategory of physical/technical info. I understood it as whether or not the original object had

derivatives in other formats. Within DC, it would go under “Format” with maybe a note explaining its status. However, what I realized while categorizing DC was that many of the field names listed could either be identified as a different category that would apply to DC or just be a section that DC has failed to address. All of the general field names on the template could be placed under one of the 15 elements DC has. It is because there are only 15 elements that they can refer to very broad categories. For example, where duration may be a specific note made in MODS or a field in MARC, in DC it would just technically fall under the element “Format” for the majority of the cases. Because “Type” could also refer to whether the film is a “Short” or “Feature Length”, but these descriptions seem to refer more to the film in general rather than the technical aspect of ‘how long the moving image lasts’. Then the issue of date is important because with moving images there are various date facts that should be noted: date of creation, date of production, date issued, date it arrived at the collection, etc. They cannot all be under date without any type of note attached to it. What confused me, which really wasn’t that much of an issue, was distinguishing “Unqualified” DublinCore versus “Qualified” DublinCore. The only visible difference seen from the charts (without going into the detail of history and creation) is that ‘Qualified’ seems to be just a bit more detailed.

The following websites were used for references

MARC: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/>

MODS: <http://www.loc.gov/mods>

Dublin Core: <http://www.dublincore.org/documents/dcmi-terms/>

DC Elements: <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/june06/zeng/06zeng.html>

MODS to DublinCore: <http://www.loc.gov/standards/mods/mods-dcsimple.html>

MARC to DublinCore: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc2dc.html>

MODS to MARC: <http://www.loc.gov/standards/mods/v3/mods2marc-mapping.html>