Shira Peltzman
Access to Moving Image Archives
CINE-GT 1803-001
Nancy Goldman and Linda Tadic
December 10, 2011

Data Crosswalk Summary

MARC

A significant benefit to cataloguing in MARC is that because MARC is such an established data standard, it will likely be easier to migrate information from system to system. Another benefit to using MARC is that of the three data standards I mapped, MARC proved to be the most granular. This is a benefit for institutions that seek to provide advanced searching options for researchers. The granularity of MARC also has a downside, however, which is that due to its large number of subfields, MARC is by far the most complex data standard of the three. As a result, using MARC as a data standard will mean that it will take a longer amount of time to create a record for a given item. It will also take cataloguers who are not trained to use MARC a significantly longer period of time to become proficient in it, thereby further prolonging the cataloguing process.

Another downside to MARC is that because MARC was primarily designed for use within a library context, there are several categories of information that it does not contain that are particularly important for media. For example, although it is technically possible to shoehorn the aspect ratio into MARC, there is no real category within MARC for this information.

Because it is not purpose built for a collection of moving images, MARC is perhaps most useful for a mixed collection (such as a library) and least useful for institutions that hold content that is exclusively comprised of moving images.

PBCore

PBCore has a rich level of granularity. Because it follows the FRBR model, PBCore distinguishes between information about the manifestation of the work and the work itself. Additionally, an advantage to PBCore is that it was designed specifically with moving images in mind. Therefore, certain information such as the aspect ratio that is specific to moving images (and which, therefore, does not fit easily into other data standards) fits easily into this one. As a result, this standard will prove most useful for collections that contain only moving images.

One significant downside to PBCore, however, is that it is difficult to distinguish between different instantiations of a single asset. This is particularly unhelpful for an institution like a moving image archive that would be likely to have various instantiations of a single asset in their collection. Another downside to PBCore is that, since it is a standard used more for broadcasting and technical information than for archival collections of moving images, there are certain fields that this data standard lacks. These include acquisition information and specific preservation action fields, which is especially important for archival collections.

Therefore, PBCore is perhaps most useful for institutions that contain only moving images, but not those institutions that are geared toward academic use or that have a that focus on the preservation of their collections.

DublinCore

The information that can be recorded in a Dublin Core record is minimal. A record created using only Dublin Core subject fields will provide very little overall information, and is thus unhelpful for any institution that wishes to provide advanced searching options to researchers or more in-depth information about the material they hold. Another downside to Dublin Core is that because it was not created specifically for cataloguing moving images, there are no subfields within Dublin Core for technical, preservation, and acquisition information. This information is particularly relevant to a moving image record, thus making Dublin Core a poor choice for archives with significant moving image material.

   The benefit to using Dublin Core is that it is an exceedingly easy data standard to employ, and even someone with no background whatsoever in cataloguing can use it. This makes it a good option for archives with very limited staffing and/or resources.