Caroline Gil   November 15, 2014.

Rebecca Guenther

Metadata for Moving Image Collections Fall 2014

<u>Assignment #2 Crosswalk Evaluation</u>

The MARC21 standard seemed to fulfill almost all of the general fields provided for the crosswalk. According to the Library of Congress website[1], field 090- Shelf Location or Local Call Number are obsolete. It is recommended to use the 024- Other Standard Identifier. Obsolete fields and outdated technology seem to be a problem for this standard. However, MARC21 was the only standard to include a field for preservation actions. That field is of extreme importance for Moving Image collections. MARC21 uses controlled vocabulary, this was especially helpful in the Genre field, a highly contested term in the Moving Image arena. The MARC21 website offers mapping equivalencies with most common metadata standards, which may be very helpful when dealing with ingesting records from different institutions. One problem MARC21may have is that fields like Title and Creator have many differing tag names or options, that may be positive in terms of granularity but may turn confusing for the cataloguer and was specially evident when contrasting with the Dublin Core standard which has a rigid 15 elements.

I was hoping the MODS schema would be easier to use, since it is based of on XML and it is purported to be an alternative in between complex and simple standards. This proved to be a double-edged sword in terms of granularity. MODS does not define the full array of fields and subfields provided by MARC, but on the upside it is far better in terms of compatibility with existing resource descriptions. For Moving Image records, MODS does not seem to support film specific descriptors all that well. No format specific fields exist for running time, sound, color, file size or film gauge, they can be added through notes or physical description subjects. MODS also eschews controlled vocabulary,

---

[1] http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd09x.html

subsisting on generalized language based tags, this can lead to confusing or fuzzy descriptions.

Finally, Dublin Core's ease of use was contested by its lack of specific details. For example, title fields can only be specified as alternative titles through sub-elements. Identifiers cannot be described by type. Other fields appear to be more open; the element "coverage" can contain or refer to anything from dates to geographical locations. The element "Contributor" cannot be defined by type (person, corporation or contributor description). Dublin Core was also deficient when describing Moving Image records; the only attribute to do so was "format" followed by type. To its defense, Simple and Qualified Dublin Core and its accompanying 15-18 elements offer a clarity and simplicity by sticking to a limited number of optional fundamentals. It might not be the best tool for specialist collections, however its simplicity allows non-professionals to create descriptive records with straightforwardness. Dublin Core's continued development and revision will without a doubt contribute to its popularity amongst small libraries and archives.