

MARC Field	Dublin Core Term	Data Value	Implementation Notes
037 (Source of Acquisition)	Publisher	Proquest	<p>The translation from the source of acquisition to the publisher isn't a smooth leap of logic, but this enables us to keep Proquest in the resulting record.</p> <p>The Stock Number & Publishers Address were lost in the conversion</p>
100 (Main Entry—Personal Name)	Contributor.aut	Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616	DC element qualified using MARC relator code. Data value follows LC name authority.
240 (Uniform Title)	Title.Alternative	Hamlet	
245 (Title Statement)	Title	The tragicall historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke by William Shake-speare. As it hath beene diuerse times acted by his Highnesse seruants in the cittie of London: as also in the two vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and else-where	<p>The main title was taken from the Title Statement as this is the primary title for the resource. Other, more accessible titles were listed under Title.Alternative and were created from the 240 & 246 fields</p>

			respectively.
245 (Title Statement)	Type	Electronic Resource	
246 (Alternate Title)	Title.Alternative	Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke	
260\$b (Name of Publisher, Distributer, etc.)	Publisher	Valentine Simmons and Iohn Trundell	Wasn't sure where else to list the additional names but felt they should be included. As they were in the MARC publisher field I felt comfortable listing them as publishers.
260\$c (Date of publication, distribution, etc.)	Date.Created	1603	I wasn't sure where the 4/27/2006 came from as it wasn't in the sample record in the assignment. So I changed this field to match the 260\$c
245 (Title Statement)	Coverage.Spatial	London, England	The usage of London in the title justified keeping the Coverage.Spatial field from the template as it does inform the user of the items setting.

300\$a (Physical Description)	Format.Extent	66 pp.	
500 (Notes)	Description	Reproduction of the original in the British Library. Mostly in verse. Title page lacking. Printer's and publishers' names supplied from STC. Running title reads: "The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke." Signatures: [A] ² (-A1) B-I ⁴ .	Relevant notes combined from multiple 500 fields.
830 (Series Added Entry)	isPartOf	Early English Books Online	isPartOf replaces the series statement
856 (Electronic Location and Access)	Identifier	http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu:2048/login?url=http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_val_fmt=&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:11497	DC uses URI
856 (Electronic Location and Access)	Identifier	http://ezproxy.mnl.umkc.edu/login?url=http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_val_fmt=&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:11497	DC uses URI

The MARC to Dublin Core crosswalk highlighted the differences between MARC and Dublin Core, emphasized the challenges of record conversion and demonstrated a clear need for more terms if Dublin Core were ever to replace MARC.

The main difference between the MARC and the Dublin Core record was their depth. MARC went into extreme detail and was larger and more complete. The new Dublin Core record was shorter and used simpler terms. MARC's use of numbers made the actual

record unfriendly to the users, which is contrasted by Dublin Cores easily understandable terms. A similarity between the two systems was their use of repeated fields. This was explored when translating the 240 & the two 246 MARC fields to the Title and Title.Alternative fields in Dublin Core.

The process of completing a crosswalk from MARC to Dublin Core turned out far harder than anticipated. While some of the fields translated directly across, like the 245 to Title far more didn't have an exact fit or were unable to be migrated. The series statement, something generally included in cataloging files I eventually found a place for under isPartOf, but even after reading the description on the DCMI Metadata terms site repeatedly I remained unsure if this placement was correct. Additionally vast amounts of information that MARC easily included did not translate over. I lacked the language for all of the early MARC fields (001-008) and struggled with omitting them. In the end the administrative use of those early MARC fields was something that was easy to sacrifice while creating a user friendly record.

For Dublin Core to replace MARC in a library setting more terms would need to be created to enable more of the details from the MARC record to be translated into Dublin Core. I was particularly frustrated when I was unable to locate a Dublin Core term for the time that the record had last been updated (MARC 005). Keeping track of updates is something that I see as being particularly important. Additionally I couldn't figure out a way to include the citation/references note (MARC 510) which is another area I see as being particularly relevant.

MARC and Dublin Core are two metadata schemes with different audiences and goals. What Dublin Core has in simplicity it lacks in depth. MARC's complexity may make it initially unappealing but it makes up for it with depth. Throughout the conversion from MARC to Dublin Core some fields were altered to fit the new scheme while others were dropped altogether. The loss of information while undesirable was unavoidable with the limitations of the new scheme.

25 Excellent work Andrew. I'm consistently impressed by the insight and clarity of your writing and your analysis shows a very high-level understanding of
of metadata functionality. I especially like your mapping of 245 to Coverage.Spatial because of "London" in the title – great catch! Your mapping instincts are
25 terrific and I hope you'll do more work in this field. -Melissa