

Dublin Core

The Dublin Core data standard's broad level of description, and loose "buckets" style fields, allows for a record creator to use their own discretion when mapping metadata of a resource. This can be advantageous when attempting to describe a quality of a resource that is not explicitly defined by a field, element or attribute, a problem often confronted in more granular data standards. However, the lack of granularity of Dublin Core also has its disadvantages. Some fields or classes of Dublin Core may be close to the quality one is trying to describe while not being exactly accurate. For example, the bit depth of a file could be placed in the "FileFormat" class of the "Format" field, as it does pertain to the formatting of a file. However, from a more didactic perspective, bit depth is not a file format. It could easily not occur to user to look in this field for that information. An institutional practice and awareness of the location of bit depth information would solve this problem, but only for the individuals at one institution, making the metadata less interoperable, and harder to share.

PBCore

Much like Dublin Core, PBCore's strength is also its weakness: it was designed with public television resources in mind. Therefore, PBCore can very granularly describe many qualities of moving image resources such as bit depth, aspect ratio, generation and file size. This is not the case when attempting to describe qualities that are less relevant to public television, such as acquisition information or preservation action, metadata that other standards describe very well. PBCore's flexibility, by providing many fields, but requiring very few, and allowing for extensions as necessary, combat this specificity to public television resources, but the bias remains.

MODS

As a traditional metadata standard, MODS has a high level of organized granularity, but is not designed with moving image resources in mind. Due to this historical preference, MODS is much better suited for describing books and other traditional resources. Terms and fields which have obvious applications to publications, such as “edition,” must contort to apply to moving images, which would refer to the equivalent of an edition as a “version” or “director’s cut.” The same is true for MODS high level of organization. The catch-all “note” field is particularly helpful when describing moving images, but the specific list of note types, and physical description note types, is limiting. While this thorough list makes it possible to better understand where specific information ought to go, if one hopes to map a quality that is not listed, it suggests this information should go somewhere else. This could be problematic when dealing with metadata that does not seem to “fit” in any other field.