Luke Moses
CINE-GT 1803: Metadata for Moving Image Collections
Fall 2014
Assignment #2

The general takeaway after mapping between standards is that Dublin Core is

limited but relatively easy to use, MARC is both broad and granular but requires a large

amount of research before selecting elements that best fit a field, and PBCore is somewhere

in between. Certain elements in MARC are clear-cut. For example, the creator personal

name is indicated by 100$a, with indicators that signify the format of the name (e.g., 1 to

indicate inverted name beginning with a surname). It can get also as granular as the

cataloger desires, and entry fields can be linked. Element 386, creator/contributor

characteristics, utilizes controlled vocabularies to indicate groups that creator(s) and

contributor(s) belong to. In an example from the Library of Congress,

"##$m Religious group**$a**Christians**$a**Buddhists**$2**lcsh," "Christians" and "Buddhists" are

both creator/contributor terms ($a), which belong to the demographic group term

"Religious group" ($m). This uses "lcsh" (Library of Congress Subject Headings) as the

source ($2) for the controlled vocabulary.[1]

PBCore is in between MARC and Dublin Core, with subelements as specific as

"FileSize," but in other instances requiring a wide range of information to be placed under a

single subheading (e.g., "rightsSummary" for a lot of copyright information). PBCore clearly

distinguishes between different sorts of media with "instatiationPhysical,"

"instatiationDigital," and "instatiationMediaType," but almost to a fault, leaving little room

---

[1] http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd386.html

for multi- or mixed media works. The "instatiationMediaType" descriptor seems somewhat subjective, despite allowing for controlled vocabularies in the "ref" attribute. Navigating containers and elements also requires an amount of technical knowledge, similar to MARC but not quite to that extent.

Compared to the other two standards, Dublin Core is much easier to use. The majority of the elements are very clearly named: title, date, format, etc. The most obvious downside is that this leaves some (perhaps too much) room for interpretation. Distinguishing a creator from a contributor can be difficult, and the "alternative" title subelement is vague. Format is mostly limited to the subelement "extent", although using qualifiers allows elements such as "FileFormat." Overall Dublin Core is suitable for a smaller institution, one without a full-time cataloger or without the knowledge necessary to navigate standards such as MARC or PBCore. MARC is somewhat unwieldy, with numerous elements, subelements, and indicators muddying up what could be a very simple process of cataloging format if it had been set up with moving images in mind. PBCore may require some amount of training to use but with controlled vocabularies can be quite useful, more specific than Dublin Core but not as difficult as MARC.

<u>Sources:</u>

http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd386.html

http://pbcore.org/v2/elements/pbcoredescriptiondocument/pbcoreinstantiation/instantiationphysical/

http://www.dublincore.org/documents/dcmi-terms/