

Introduction

This paper contains sample metadata records created with Note Tab Light, using the ERC and DC metadata schemes. Five sample records were created for each scheme, using the same 5 documents.

Electronic Resource Citation Records

ERCrecord1

who: Brand, Amy | Daly, Frank | Meyers, Barbara

what: Metadata

when: 2003

where: http://www.niso.org/standards/resources/Metadata_Demystified.pdf

ERCrecord2

who: Canadian Heritage

what: Metadata Standards for Museum Cataloging

when: 2004-08-20

where: http://www.chin.gc.ca/English/Standards/metadata_description.html

ERCrecord3

who: Hillman, Diane

what: Using Dublin Core

when: 2003-08-26

where: <http://dublincore.org/documents/usageguide/>

ERCrecord4

who: van den Brink, Linda

who: Tauber, James

what: XML Software

when: 2005-01-25

where: <http://www.xmlsoftware.com/>

ERCrecord5

who: Caplan, Priscilla

what: International Metadata Initiatives

when: 2001-01-23

where: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/bibcontrol/caplan_paper.html

Dublin Core Records

DCrecord1

```

<META NAME="DC.Title" LANG="en" CONTENT="Metadata Demystified">
<META NAME="DC.Creator" LANG="en" CONTENT="Brand, Amy">
<META NAME="DC.Creator" LANG="en" CONTENT="Daly, Frank">
<META NAME="DC.Creator" LANG="en" CONTENT="Meyers, Barbara">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Metadata">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Open Archives Initiative">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="Overview of evolving
metadata conventions.">
<META NAME="DC.Publisher" LANG="en" CONTENT="NISO Press">
<META NAME="DC.Publisher" LANG="en" CONTENT="Sheridan Press">
<META NAME="DC.Contributor" LANG="en" CONTENT="Harris, Pat">
<META NAME="DC.Contributor" LANG="en" CONTENT="Parente, Susan">
<META NAME="DC.Date" LANG="en" CONTENT="2003">
<META NAME="DC.Type" LANG="en" CONTENT="text">
<META NAME="DC.Format" LANG="en" CONTENT="text/PDF">
<META NAME="DC.Identifier" LANG="en" CONTENT="1-880124-59-9">
<META NAME="DC.Identifier" LANG="en"
CONTENT="http://www.niso.org/standards/resources/Metadata_Demystified.pdf">
<META NAME="DC.Source" LANG="en" CONTENT="electronic">
<META NAME="DC.Language" LANG="en" CONTENT="en">

```

DCrecord2

```

<META NAME="DC.Title" LANG="en" CONTENT="Metadata Standards for Museum
Cataloging">
<META NAME="DC.Creator" LANG="en" CONTENT="Canadian Heritage">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Metadata standards">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Museum Cataloging">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Collection description">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="Standards for the
creation and exchange of data about objects in museum collections">
<META NAME="DC.Publisher" LANG="en" CONTENT="Canadian Heritage">
<META NAME="DC.Date" LANG="en" CONTENT="2004-08-20">
<META NAME="DC.Type" LANG="en" CONTENT="text">
<META NAME="DC.Format" LANG="en" CONTENT="text/html">
<META NAME="DC.Identifier" LANG="en"
CONTENT="http://www.chin.gc.ca/English/Standards/metadata_description.html">
<META NAME="DC.Language" LANG="en" CONTENT="en">
<META NAME="DC.Language" LANG="en" CONTENT="fr">
<META NAME="DC.Rights" LANG="en"
CONTENT="http://www.chin.gc.ca/English/Notices/index.html">

```

DCrecord3

```

<META NAME="DC.Title" LANG="en" CONTENT="Using Dublin Core">
<META NAME="DC.Creator" LANG="en" CONTENT="Hillman, Diane">

```

```

<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Dublin Core Metadata
Initiative">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="What is Dublin Core.">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="HTML">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="RDF/XML">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="Storage and maintence
issues">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="Element Content and
Controlled Vocabularies">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="What is metadata.">
<META NAME="DC.Publisher" LANG="en" CONTENT="DCMI">
<META NAME="DC.Publisher" LANG="en" CONTENT="OCLC">
<META NAME="DC.Date" LANG="en" CONTENT="2003-08-26">
<META NAME="DC.Type" LANG="en" CONTENT="text">
<META NAME="DC.Format" LANG="en" CONTENT="text/html">
<META NAME="DC.Identifier" LANG="en"
CONTENT="http://dublincore.org/documents/usageguide/">
<META NAME="DC.Language" LANG="en" CONTENT="en">
<META NAME="DC.Rights" LANG="en"
CONTENT="http://dublincore.org/about/privacy/">

```

DCrecord4

```

<META NAME="DC.Title" LANG="en" CONTENT="Welcome to XML Software">
<META NAME="DC.Creator" LANG="en" CONTENT="van den Brink, Linda">
<META NAME="DC.Creator" LANG="en" CONTENT="Tauber, James">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="XML software">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="web links related to
XML software">
<META NAME="DC.Contributor" LANG="en" CONTENT="van Oven, Barry">
<META NAME="DC.Date" LANG="en" CONTENT="2005-01-25">
<META NAME="DC.Type" LANG="en" CONTENT="text">
<META NAME="DC.Format" LANG="en" CONTENT="text/html">
<META NAME="DC.Identifier" LANG="en"
CONTENT="http://www.xmlsoftware.com/">
<META NAME="DC.Language" LANG="en" CONTENT="en">

```

DCrecord5

```

<META NAME="DC.Title" LANG="en" CONTENT="Conference on Bibliographic
Control in the New Millennium">
<META NAME="DC.Title" LANG="en" CONTENT=" International Metadata
Initiatives: Lessons in Bibliographic Control">
<META NAME="DC.Creator" LANG="en" CONTENT="Caplan, Priscilla">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Metadata initiatives">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Text Encoding Initiative ">

```

```

<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Encoded Archival
Description">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Dublin Core Metadata
Element Set">
<META NAME="DC.Subject" LANG="en" CONTENT="Visual Resources Association
">
<META NAME="DC.Description" LANG="en" CONTENT="Functional requirements
for metadata">
<META NAME="DC.Publisher" LANG="en" CONTENT="Library of Congress">
<META NAME="DC.Date" LANG="en" CONTENT="2001-01-23">
<META NAME="DC.Type" LANG="en" CONTENT="text">
<META NAME="DC.Format" LANG="en" CONTENT="text/html">
<META NAME="DC.Identifier" LANG="en"
CONTENT="http://www.loc.gov/catdir/bibcontrol/caplan_paper.html">
<META NAME="DC.Language" LANG="en" CONTENT="en">

```

Discussion

This assignment introduced me to the intricacies of ERC and DC metadata schemes. I had only ever seen DC records before, and I had never heard of ERC. I work in an academic library and see MARC daily, although I hardly ever manipulate the records. But I am familiar with the look and feel of MARC records. So, my opinion of ERC and DC might be biased towards how I have interacted with MARC.

The generic metadata editor chosen for this assignment, Note Tab Light, was difficult to install and start up with the ERC and DC metadata notations. After several attempts and reinstallations, and a change of Web browsers, Note Tab Light finally worked correctly. Once it came to entering the metadata, the assignment was less frustrating.

ERC is not as intuitive of a scheme as DC. The prompts for the ERC scheme did not include everything necessary to create a useful metadata record. There are not prompts for more information about each of the four required elements. The program used should prompt for more information in order to create a better ERC record; the user should not need to go away from the metadata editing program to find more fields to include in the record. If `erc-about`, `erc-from`, and `erc-support` are to be included in all ERC records, then they should be prompted for. Only having prompts for ERC that deal with the main expression in the piece being described is inadequate. The record that is created with the basic ERC fields does not contain very much information. Also, how the prompts are transferred to the record is not adequate, especially related to the DC records. The records do not seem to be easily read by a machine. Although, the records would be easily read by a human being, and all four of the Categories would be easily understood by someone who is not used to seeing metadata records.

The metadata records that are created by Note Tab Light for the DC records are more complete than the ERC records. All of the fifteen fields available in DC are prompted for. The user does not need to enter information for each of the fields. But if the information is available, then it can be entered in the appropriate fields. The field

names that are created in the record along with the entered data are easier to read than expected. The quality is much better than with the ERC records. More specific information can be entered into any one of the fifteen fields than in the ERC records, because of the category definitions. Never were all fifteen fields used in any one record, but the fields that applied to the document classified were always used.

One of the main problems that Kunze has with DC seems to be that DC does not require any one field to be present in any metadata record. I did not find this to be a problem in this exercise. There was always a field (usually more than one) that applied to the document being classified. Overall ERC felt inadequate when actually used for creating metadata records. I did not expect this. The idea of having to create a "story" felt far too informal.

The basic problem of DC not requiring any specific fields to be included in its records is understandable. ERC attempts to solve this problem. ERC requires something to be entered into each of its 4 fields, but various codes for reasons for no data being found can be entered. This still does not require actual information to be present. All it is telling the user reading the metadata is that the information was not found, no matter the reason. Yet it could also be assumed that if the field was not included in a DC record that the information also was not present. A better solution than implementing ERC to solve the problems with DC would be to require at least one of the DC elements to be present (even with a not applicable), rather than creating the new scheme. It will be interesting to see how the collaboration between ERC and DC plays out.

Comparatively DC is much closer to MARC than ERC is. It would seem easier for libraries to supplement MARC usage with DC rather than with ERC. MARC also does not have any required fields. But this does not seem to be an issue with that format, so it should not matter with concern to DC. ERC records could also end up without any actual information in them.

ERC makes more sense for a smaller localized collection where the institution can set up its own parameter for how to use ERC, the qualifiers and the story. For consortia use parameters need to be laid out beforehand by all institutions involved. It is nice that ERC is aiming for non-computer users. But in so doing it becomes harder for computer users to use it with ease, yet small institutions without a large computer budget could use ERC for their metadata needs.

Summary and Conclusion

I have seen a situation with several libraries collaborating on a collection with all libraries agreeing to use DC. Problems arose from DC not requiring any specific fields and the consortia not setting out any required fields before the project started. DC was used for the collection, but not all records created by the different libraries contained all of the same fields, even though all of the documents were similar. After reading about the DC elements I understand why this happened, due to local interpretation of the DC rules. But I do not think that ERC would have solved this particular problem. There was also a problem with controlled vocabulary, but that is an entirely different problem.

Creation of DC records was more straight forward than ERC record creation, mainly because the DC categories are more specific and with better rules that define what

should be entered in each of the categories. Fewer fields were used in the ERC, but this did not allow for a complete feeling records. The field names in DC allowed for more specific data to be entered in the fields.

The problem with both metadata schemes is knowing how much data to include in each record. For example, the Subject/What field in each scheme did not specify a level of depth in which to include in the field. Should the main subject of the piece be the only one listed? Should all subjects mentioned be listed? I assume the compromise is somewhere in the middle of the two extreme depths, but where exactly? I decided to include the main categories and then a few of the main subcategories.