

**SECTION 1**  
 Dublin Core Record

**Table 1 *Dublin Core Record***

	<i>Name</i>	<i>Value</i>
1	Title	Winter Pays For Summer
2	Subject Subject Subject Subject.LCSH	Rock Music Indie Music Singer/Songwriter Rock music--United States--2001-2010
3	Description.TableOfContents  Description	Duck and Cover; Thankful; Courage; Released; Cleareyed; Falling; Half Life; True; Easier; Finally Fading; Simple; Gather; Don't Need Anything Glen Phillips's third solo release.
4	Type	Sound
5	Source	
6	Relation	
7	Coverage.RecordingStudio Coverage.RecordingStudio Coverage.MixingStudio Coverage.MasteringStudio	Paramount Recording Studio, Hollywood, CA Mansfield Lodge Studio, Los Angeles, CA Mix This! Pacific Palisades, CA The Mastering Lab, Los Angeles, CA
8	Creator	Phillips, Glen, 1970-
9	Publisher Publisher.Place	Lost Highway Records Nashville, TN
10	Contributor.Bass Contributor.Cello Contributor.Co-writer Contributor.Drums Contributor.Engineer Contributor.Engineer Contributor.Guitar Contributor.Guitar Contributor.Guitar Contributor.Guitar Contributor.Keyboards Contributor.Mastering Contributor.Mastering Contributor.Mixing Contributor.Mixing	Anton, Jim Blacke, Stevie Wilson, Dan Thomas, Pete Fields, John Miller, Steven Brion, Jon Chaves, Michael Fields, John Suran, Greg Fields, John Hadley, Robert Sax, Doug Clearmountain, Bob Fields, John

<i>Name</i>	<i>Value</i>
Contributor.Mixing	Miller, Steven
Contributor.MouthTabla	Scott, Tom "Spicy T"
Contributor.Organ	Busbee, Mike
Contributor.PedalSteel	Heywood, Eric
Contributor.Percussion	Chastain, Ken
Contributor.Piano	Busbee, Mike
Contributor.Producer	Fields, John
Contributor.Recording	Testa, Chris
Contributor.Saxophone	Gallagher, Brian
Contributor.SlideGuitar	Wilson, Dan
Contributor.BackgroundVocals	Folds, Ben
Contributor.BackgroundVocals	Foreman, Jon
Contributor.BackgroundVocals	Mooney, Kristin
Contributor.BackgroundVocals	Ruekberg, Michael
Contributor.BackgroundVocals	Strumer, Andy
Contributor.WurlitzerPiano	Wilson, Dan
11 Rights	© 2005 UMG Recordings, Inc., 54 Music Square East, Nashville, TN 37203. Distributed by Universal Music & Video Distribution, Corp. Warning: all rights reserved.
12 Date.Copyrighted	2005
Date.Issued	2005-03-29
13 Format.Medium	4.75 in. disc
Format.Medium	Audio Compact Disc
Format.Extent	45 minutes
14 Identifier.UPC	602498640371
Identifier.PublisherNumber	B0003533-02
15 Language.ISO639-3	eng
16 Audience	
17 Provenance	

	<i>Name</i>	<i>Value</i>
18	Rights Holder	All Songs written by Glen Phillips © 2003 Umami Music (ASCAP), except “True,” “Cleareyed” and “Released” written by Glen Phillips and Dan Wilson © 2004 Umami Music; Chrysalis Music/Sugar Lake Music, admin. By Chrysalis Music (ASCAP). All rights reserved. Used by permission. International copyright secured.
19	Instructional Method	
20	Accrual Method	
21	Accrual Periodicity	
22	Accrual Policy	

### Explanation of Dublin Core Record

Metadata creation is a humbling experience. With rules and specialized vocabularies, the creation is a maze that joins both the record creator and end user in the middle. The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) created six principles to guide the creation of beneficial metadata:

- Good metadata should be appropriate to the materials in the collection, users of the collection, and intended, current and likely use of the digital object.
- Good metadata supports interoperability.
- Good metadata uses standard controlled vocabularies to reflect the what, where, when and who of the content.
- Good metadata includes a clear statement on the conditions and terms of use for the digital object.
- Good metadata records are objects themselves and therefore should have the qualities of archivability, persistence, unique identification, etc.
- Good metadata should be authoritative and verifiable.
- Good metadata supports the long-term management of objects in collections. (NISO, 2004)

I attempted to adhere to these six principles throughout the creation of the Dublin Core record presented in Table 1. I would also add objectivity to the qualities needed to create metadata, especially in respect to visual artwork, musical sound recordings, and other fine art realms that are often left open to an end user’s interpretation.

Using the expanded Dublin Core [DC] scheme, I took the approach of creating a record for use in a music library. Datta (2002) states that in order to select a useful structure for musical information, the creator needs knowledge of music, the product from which to retrieve the data, and the use of the created record. I did not have an option as to the scheme (structure) used to create a record; however, I did find that DC was flexible and

allowed for inclusion of data pertinent to a musician. The DC record is to serve as the least common denominator on which other schemes can be based in order for searches to cover a common set of data (Caplan, 2003). I obtained the compact disc [CD], which contains the physical and auditory product, as a source of information for the record.

To begin I acquired the qualified DC field names (Hillman, 2005) and appropriate qualifiers (DCMI, 2005), and I visually inspected the CD and booklet to gather information. The fields of Title and Creator could immediately be filled since the information was straightforward. In the Creator field, I chose to place the name into the traditional format of surname, given name, birth year, and death year to avoid confusion with another Glenn Phillips who is also a musician. I also chose this format based on my survey of Library of Congress DC records where most other composers, especially classical, are placed into the field in this manner.

At this point, I placed the disc into the computer to get information on the album length as well as a way to easily move track names to the DC record for the table of contents. Using iTunes, I viewed the information the program retrieved for the disc's metadata from Cddb. Cddb uses a universalist method of collecting metadata, creating its shared database from user-submitted information and achieving "excellent results" (Pachet, La Burthe, Aucouturier, & Beuriv , 2005). Because this information was end-user created, I was wary of obtaining any metadata other than total playing time from this source. I confirmed that all track names corresponded to the CD inserts before copying the data to the Description.TableOfContents field. I chose to include all of the songs, separated by semicolon, in a single field rather than a repetition due to them comprising one work and not being a collection of individual, unrelated items. Also, I chose not to enter any other descriptors beyond the mention of the disc being Phillips's third solo release due to the potential to be biased when referring to mood, lyrics, and tempo. From here, I also connected to the iTunes Store where I discovered the release date. The Date.Issued field holds this information. I chose to keep the Issued qualifier due to its accepted status in DCMI instead of changing it to Release Date, which is not included in the list of qualifiers.

Subject is another field that requires objectivity. Since genres and characteristics rapidly evolve in popular music, I chose to include a corresponding Library of Congress Subject Heading among the simple keyword descriptions. The year included in this subject also helps the searcher to determine if this is the time period for which they are searching and the use of controlled vocabularies aid a searcher in finding an accurate item (Caplan, 2003). I found it very hard to determine subject since a category or key words gives information about the work and also "shapes the individual's interaction with it (Jacob, 2004)." Some listeners call this style rock, pop, or folk, while others call it indie, and a current trend is to label this style with the singer/songwriter classification. I chose to include rock music since it is a wide category and falls into the lowest common denominator principle of DC.

Since DC is flexible, qualifiers for instrumental and production roles were added to the contributor field. This album contains contributions by many well-known artists that may be of interest to someone searching for a certain musician. The field was repeated for each contributor, organized by instruments, and values entered by surname followed by given name. I chose not to include birth years for these people since the task of tracking

this information would not add anything to the DC record and make it more complex.

The coverage, publisher, and format fields also received qualifiers. In the coverage area, I adapted the spatial qualifier to the different studios and locations used to create this CD. Studios may be of interest to a musician who is interested in the sonic quality of a recording or to do research on a studio before reserving it. The publisher caused some doubt in my mind. The booklet gave a list of publishers involved with the creation of this album while the physical disc cited different one. I opted for the one on the spine of the CD since the publisher number (explained later in this paper) corresponded to the name. To keep consistency in the record, I entered the location of the publisher. In the format field, I included the actual measurements of a compact disc due to confusion with other size discs, such as minidisks and laser discs. The fact that this item is an audio CD is also noted since this is the common name and to avoid confusion with some CDs that contain multimedia or video.

Three other fields are qualified by a DCMI approved term, and one field contains a DCMI vocabulary description. In the language field, ISO396-3 qualified it with the value of *eng* (English). Date contained the qualification copyright whose value could be found printed on the actual CD as well as the booklet. The final qualified term was identifier. For this I used the Universal Product Code [UPC] which is unique to each product, as well as creating a Publisher Number qualifier. The publisher number is unique to each production house and corresponds to a single work. The field with the DCMI vocabulary description is Type. According to DCMI Type Vocabulary, the term to use in this area is Sound (2008).

The Rights and Right Holder fields seem to slightly overlap. DCMI's *Using Dublin Core – The Elements* states that the Right field covers, "Information about rights held in and over the resource," while Rights Holder is, "a person or organization owning or managing rights over the resource." On the CD, booklet, and cover art there were three separate copyright statements. I opted to include the CD statement for the Rights field since it contained more of the legalese regarding the rights over the resource. For the Rights Holder field, the booklet statement was inserted for the value since this statement showed that Phillips holds the copyright for the songs and they can be licensed through ASCAP. The third copyright statement found on the back of the cover art was omitted since the Rights field covered the same data with slightly different wording.

Values for six fields were omitted. The Source, Relation, Provenance, Audience, Instruction Method, and Accruals (Method, Periodicity, and Policy) were intentionally left blank since no data values correspond to them. This recording is an original work without any references to a previous volume of recordings, and it did not derive from any other copyrighted work, negating the Source and Relation fields. The audience may include any ages, and this CD is not intended for educational or instructional purposes. The rights to this recording have not changed hands and do not require the provenance field. I also do not know how it was added to the collection, but I do know that this is a one-issue item and will not be added to the collection on a frequent basis.

## SECTION 2

## AACR/MARC Record to Dublin Core Record Comparison

Figure 1 *Library of Congress Full Record Display*

*Winter pays for summer Glen Phillips.*

LC Control No.: 2005586395  
 LCCN Permalink: <http://lcn.loc.gov/2005586395>  
 Type of Material: Music Sound Recording  
 Personal Name: [Phillips, Glen, 1970-](#)  
 Main Title: Winter pays for summer [sound recording] / Glen Phillips.  
 Published/Created: Nashville, TN : Lost Highway, p2005.  
 Description: 1 sound disc : digital ; 4 3/4 in.  
 UPC/EAN: [602498640371](#)  
 Publisher No.: B0003533-02 Lost Highway  
 Contents: Duck and cover -- Thankful -- Courage -- Released -- Cleareyed -- Falling -- Half life -- True -- Easier -- Finally fading -- Simple -- Gather -- Don't need anything.  
 Notes: Compact disc.  
 Lyrics and program notes on container insert.  
 Recorded at Paramount Recording (Hollywood, CA) and Mansfield Lodge (Los Angeles, CA).  
 Credits: Producer, John Fields.  
 Subjects: [Rock music.](#)  
 LC Classification: SDB 27981  
 Other System No.: (OCoLC)ocm58807149  
 Quality Code: lccopycat

---

CALL NUMBER: [SSA 81493](#)  
 Copy 2  
 -- Request in: Recorded Sound Reference Center (Madison, LM113)  
 -- Status: Not Charged

---

CALL NUMBER: [SDB 27981](#)  
 Copy 1  
 -- Request in: Recorded Sound Reference Center (Madison, LM113)  
 -- Status: Not Charged

Table 2 *Library of Congress MARC Tags*

Tag	Indicators	Subfields and Delimiters
LC Control No.:		2005586395
LCCN Permalink:		<a href="http://lcn.loc.gov/2005586395">http://lcn.loc.gov/2005586395</a>
	000	01315cjm a2200325 a 450
	001	14067844
	005	20060313145113.0
	007	sd fsngnmmned

<i>Tag</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Subfields and Delimiters</i>
008		050808s2005 tnurn    eng d
010	__	a 2005586395
024	1_	a 602498640371
028	02	a B0003533-02  b Lost Highway
035	__	a (OCoLC)ocm58807149
040	__	a LKR  c LKR  d DLC
042	__	a lccopycat
050	00	a SDB 27981
100	1_	a Phillips, Glen,  d 1970-
245	10	a Winter pays for summer  h [sound recording] /  c Glen Phillips.
260	__	a Nashville, TN :  b Lost Highway,  c p2005.
300	__	a 1 sound disc :  b digital ;  c 4 3/4 in.
500	__	a Compact disc.
518	__	a Recorded at Paramount Recording (Hollywood, CA) and Mansfield Lodge (Los Angeles, CA).
508	__	a Producer, John Fields.
500	__	a Lyrics and program notes on container insert.
505	00	t Duck and cover --  t Thankful --  t Courage --  t Released --  t Cleareyed --  t Falling --  t Half life --  t True --  t Easier --  t Finally fading --  t Simple --  t Gather --  t Don't need anything.
650	_0	a Rock music.
906	__	a 7  b cbc  c copycat  d 2  e ncip  f 20  g y-genmusic
925	0_	a acquire  b 2 shelf copies  x policy default
955	__	a vn34 2005-08-08 z-client  i vn34 2005-08-08  e vn34 2005-08-08 to MBRS/RS  e vn34 2006-03-13 copy 2 to

Tag	Indicators	Subfields and Delimiters
		MBRS/RS
985	__	a smcd  e cdpop

### Comparison of Dublin Core Record to Library of Congress Records

Figure 1 is a screen shot of the Library of Congress full display record, while Table 2 duplicates the Machine Readable Cataloging [MARC] record. Although both utilize the same underlying metadata database and scheme, they are displayed very differently. The MARC record is a tool and structure for creating meaningful metadata. The full display record is for the common users since they would not understand or want to learn the coding of a MARC record. The display takes the MARC information, decodes it from the database, and makes it user-centered. It decodes the tags, indicators, subfields and delimiters into an easily understood record. However, the underlying database can be created with Dublin Core and still display the same record if the proper decoders are installed.

DC records and MARC records contain a number of similarities and also possess a number of differences. By using a crosswalk, such as the ones found on the Library of Congress's website (2008), to cross between the DC and MARC records, a user can easily compare the records. In addition to using a crosswalk for comparison, I also utilized the Online Computer Library Center's [OCLC] Bibliographic Formats and Standards (2007) pages for tags, identifiers, and subfields that these crosswalks did not encompass. Also referenced was the Library of Congress's *MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data*.

The first item I noticed upon inspection is that the MARC record contained leader data in tags 000 through 008. This area contains administrative and structural data. Administrative data is comprised of management, decision making, and record keeping items, where as structural data is formulated with information to make the digital information package work (Taylor, 2004). These five fields describe the type of record, control numbers (tag 001), the date and time of the most recent transaction (tag 005), along with fixed fields for the physical description (tag 007) and data elements (tag 008) (OCLC, 2007). I was not able to decode all of the fields, but only MARC tag 007 directly related to a DC value. The fixed code begins with s, declaring the item a sound recording, and this relates to the DC element Type (Library of Congress [LC] *MARC to Dublin...*, 2008) using the DCMI Type Vocabulary. The DC record in Table 1 is comprised almost exclusively of descriptive data.

I first inspected the records for similarities in Title and Creators since they are the values commonly used to identify or search for an item. Pachet, et al. (2005), states that searchers use the "title, artist, album, category (corresponding to genre) and year" to first search for an item followed by the language and keywords. The DC Title field corresponds to tag 245, in particular subfield |a. The other two subfields in this tag describe the medium and the statement of responsibility respectively. The statement of

responsibility in this case seems to reflect the Rights Holder qualifier, although the crosswalk shows that this should be included in 542|d. This MARC record does not contain this field, and therefore does not show whom to contact to obtain rights for these songs. For the DC Creator element, I found its counterpart in tag 100. According to the LC MARC to DC Crosswalk (2008), this field corresponds to Contributor. Although the creator is also a contributor to this work, this MARC display cites Phillips in the subfield Personal Name and a secondary subfield of dates associated with the name. The indicator 1\_, notifying the user that the surname is first in the field, further qualifies the MARC data. However, the MARC record contains tag 508 for Creation and Production credits (OCLC, 2007), where the creator of this record placed the producer in subfield |a. The MARC record does not contain any of the five other contributor tags, and the information contained in all of the DC Contributor fields would not nicely fit into any of these fields. This is a shortcoming of manifestation of this MARC scheme in relation to sound recordings.

Following Padgett's list, the category is the next field a user would most likely search. In the MARC record, tag 650, corresponds to the DC element Subject. This MARC record includes the qualifier of LC Subject Heading [LCSH]. LCSH is a hierarchical classification system. The qualified DC record allows for this value. However, the DC is more flexible in its descriptive data since it allows for the repetition of elements, thus providing the end user a greater chance of finding the material when searched by a specified genre. Between these two schemes, it would be difficult to achieve an accurate interoperability in this field unless qualifiers are used in the DC record. Interestingly, the locally defined MARC fields include other descriptions outside of the scope of the LCSH, such as "y-genmusic" in tag 906|g and "smcd" (possibly short for "sound/music CD") and "cdpop" in tag 985.

Language and Year are the final two data areas in the user search hierarchy. In my DC record, I chose to use the International Standards Organization's [ISO] 639-3 qualifier for language. The MARC record does not contain tag 041; however, this information is included in header tag 008. This was the choice of the cataloger to omit tag 041, which may cause a user to pass over this record. A user searching by year is looking for the DC date element, or the MARC tag 542|g or 260|c for copyright, and creation date in 260|c, 260|g, or 533|d (LC *Marc to...*, 2008). Both the DC record in Table 1 and the MARC record in Table 2 display an Issued Date, but would most likely not match up in an automated crosswalk due to a different DC qualifier and use of the expanded date format. The copyright descriptor would be translated between the two schemes, although it would be easier if the newly defined MARC tag 542|g was included.

The MARC tag 260 is a catch-all area for the imprinting publication and distribution of the item. This includes subfields for the place of publication, publisher's name, as well as the date of publication. DC splits these items up between publication and date, and allows for further qualifiers if necessary. In Table 1, the Publisher.Place is equivalent to MARC tag 260|a and Publisher (unqualified) to 260|b.

There are a few other notable similarities and differences between the DC and MARC records. The DC Description value is equivalent to the MARC 505 field. This conversion is straightforward between the two records presented. The DC value, Format, is to be found in MARC tag 300|a, and this corresponds to the DC qualifier

Extent. Both records contain this field, however, I took it at a total listening time whereas this MARC cataloger interpreted it as “1 sound disc.” Subfields |b and |c describe the other physical details and dimensions respectively. According to the MARC to Dublin Core crosswalk, tag 340|a should include the medium. This tag is not in this MARC record. Instead, the data is placed in tag 500 as a general note (OCLC, 2007). Both records chose to describe the physical size of the disc, but, once again, the crosswalk would not match up.

Coverage is another descriptor of interest. Both records allow for this data to be entered, DC in the Coverage value and MARC in a number of different tags. Since I took the DC value Coverage and qualified it with the spatial terms for the different studios, these two records would most certainly be difficult to translate from one scheme to another. The DC qualifier and values I chose barely fit in MARC tag 522, but would most likely need to be placed in tag 518 as a place of an event note as was done with this one. This data does not fit well into any MARC field, and either a general note tag 500 or tag 518 would be the closest.

What I found the most interesting in the MARC record, though, was the repetition of data in the tags. The tags were not presented in numerical order for easy scanning, and tag 500 was repeated with the same subfield code and indicators. This record was also obtained by copy cataloging as indicated in tag 042. This leads me to believe that the record was not inspected for accuracy before adding to the catalog. Thornburg & Oskins cited that libraries only correct 35.8 percent of copy cataloging errors, believing that the record will be updated when the new information is available (2007). This leaves the end user with incorrect and slanted metadata that may affect their ability to find an item.

Both MARC and DC records contain their strengths and weaknesses. DC possesses adaptability through the use of qualifiers that can be customized for the collection it describes. The open values of DC can open up the scheme for specific and targeted metadata, or DC can be too simple that the metadata contained in it is not useful. MARC provides specific framework and rules for metadata creation. On the other hand, MARC records can become extremely complex with their tags, indicators, subfields, and delimiters. A MARC record creator could mistakenly use one tag field that is similar but is not the best fit for the metadata.

Music, itself, provides a challenge to integrate it into a general collection. Had I designed the DC record for a public library rather than a music library I would have chosen the simple scheme rather than the qualified. It is important to consider the end user when creating metadata since “... the information associated with a particular category varies across individuals and across contexts” (Jacob, 2004). A music library is expected to have metadata specific to music, utilizing accepted terminology and authorities.

The area that is of particular challenge for sound recordings is that popular music can be categorized under a number of different genres. MARC records are slowly creating fields usable for music. Even with this morphing, music data is still under-represented in most common MARC records both in the way of metadata creation and end-user retrieval (Hemmasi, 2002). Metadata creation evolves over time (Thornburg & Oskins, 2007) as well as new subject headings, authorities, and musical genres, but often this

implementation does not happen in a timely manner. As evidenced by the long periods of time between document versions, the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative is criticized for not being able to obtain a consensus over qualifiers or guidance (Caplan, 2002).

As evidenced by this explanation, to translate from one scheme to another would consume some time. Since each DC record can be adapted for a particular application, a crosswalk from DC to MARC needs to be custom aligned with the values to be translated. The records displayed in Tables 1 and 2 are fairly extensive. Taylor (2004) states that, "As extensibility increases, interoperability tends to decrease." This statement is easily proven with these two records. There is still a long discussion in the future for the interoperability and refinement of these two schemes.

DO NOT COPY

**REFERENCES**

- Caplan, P. (2003). *Metadata Fundamentals for All Librarians*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Datta, D. (2002, October). *Managing Metadata*. International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR) 2002 Proceedings, Paris, France, 249-251. Retrieved July 5, 2008 from <http://ismir2002.ismir.net/Proceedings/02-FP08-4.pdf>
- Dublin Core Metadata Initiative [DCMI]. (2008, January 14). *DCMI Metadata Terms*. Retrieved July 5, 2008 from <http://www.dublincore.org/documents/dcmi-terms/>
- Dublin Core Metadata Initiative [DCMI]. (2008, January 14). *DCMI Type Vocabulary*. Retrieved July 5, 2008 from <http://dublincore.org/documents/dcmi-type-vocabulary/index.shtml>
- Dublin Core Metadata Initiative [DCMI]. (2005, November 7). *Using Dublin Core – Dublin Core Qualifiers*. Retrieved June 25, 2008 from <http://dublincore.org/documents/usageguide/qualifiers.shtml>
- Hemmasi, H. (2002, October). *Why Not MARC?* International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR) 2002 Proceedings, Paris, France, 242-248. Retrieved July 5, 2008 from <http://ismir2002.ismir.net/Proceedings/02-FP08-3.pdf>
- Hillman, D. (2005, November 7). *Using Dublin Core – The Elements*. Retrieved June 25, 2008 from <http://dublincore.org/documents/usageguide/elements.shtml>
- Jacob, E. K. (2004). Classification and Categorization: A Difference That Makes a Difference. *Library Trends*, 52(3), 515-540.
- Library of Congress. *Alpha-3 Codes Arranged Alphabetically by English Name of Language – Codes for the Representation of Names of Languages (Library of Congress)*. Retrieved June 25, 2008 from [http://www.loc.gov/standards/iso639-2/php/English\\_list.php](http://www.loc.gov/standards/iso639-2/php/English_list.php)
- Library of Congress. *Authorized, Heading, References, and Notes (Library of Congress Authorities)*. Retrieved July 5, 2008 from <http://authorities.loc.gov>
- Library of Congress. (2008, April 23). *Dublin Core to MARC Crosswalk*. Retrieved July 5, 2008 from <http://www.loc.gov/marc/dccross.html>
- Library of Congress. (2007, October). *MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data: Table of Contents*. Retrieved June 25, 2008 from <http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdhome.html>
- Library of Congress. (2008, April 24). *MARC to Dublin Core Crosswalk*.

- Retrieved July 5, 2008 from <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc2dc.html>
- Library of Congress Online Catalog. *Winter pays for summer Glen Phillips*. Retrieved June 25, 2008 from <http://lccn.loc.gov/2005586395>
- National Information Standards Organization [NISO]. (2004). *Understanding Metadata*. Retrieved July 8, 2008 from <http://www.niso.org/publications/press/UnderstandingMetadata.pdf>
- Online Computer Library Center [OCLC]. (2007, August). *Bibliographic Formats and Standards*. Retrieved June 30, 2008 from <http://www.oclc.org/us/en/bibformats/en/default.shtm>
- Pachet, F., La Burthe, A., Aucouturier, J., & Beurivé, A. (2005). Editorial Metadata in Electronic Music Distribution Systems: Between Universalism and Isolationism. *Journal of New Music Research*, 34(2), 173-184.
- Phillips, G. (2005). *Winter Pays For Summer* [CD]. Nashville: Lost Highway Records.
- Stvilia, B. 2008. Value-Based Metadata Quality Assessment. *Library and Information Science Research*, 30(1), 67-74.
- Taylor, A. G. (2004). *The Organization of Information* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.
- Thornburg, G. & Oskins, W. M. (2007). Misinformation and Bias in Metadata Processing: Matching in Large Databases. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 26(2), 15-26.
- Weibel, S. (1997). The Dublin Core: A Simple Content Description Model for Electronic Resources. *ASIS Bulletin*, 24(1). Retrieved June 30, 2008 from <http://www.asis.org/Bulletin/Oct-97/weibel.htm>

**WORKS CONSULTED**

- Beall, J. (2006). The Death of Metadata. *The Serials Librarian*, 51(2), 55-74.
- Cuvillier, J. (2007). Indexing Grey Resources: Considering Usual Behavior of Library Users and the Use of Dublin Core Metadata via a Database of Specialized Vocabulary. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 23(1), 78-88.
- Dublin Core Metadata Initiative. (2008, January 14). *DCMI Metadata Terms*. Retrieved June 27, 2008 from <http://dublincore.org/documents/dcmi-terms/index.shtml>
- Dublin Core Metadata Initiative. (2008, January 14). *Dublin Core Metadata Element Set, Version 1.1*. Accessed June 27, 2008 from <http://dublincore.org/documents/dces/>
- Eadie, M. (2008). Towards an Application Profile for Images. *Ariadne*, 55. Accessed June 27, 2008 from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk.proxy.lib.fsu.edu/issue55/eadie/>
- Furrie, Betty. (2003). Understanding MARC Bibliographic: Machine-Readable Cataloging. Retrieved June 22, 2008 from <http://www.loc.gov/marc/umb/>