FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

REPRESENTATION AND DESCRIPTION PAPER

SUBMITTED FOR LIS5703 INFORMATION ORGANIZATION

PROFESSOR: DR. MICHELLE KAZMER

By

JAMIE WITMAN

Graduate Student – LIS Master's Program

Part 1(a) – Compare Contrast MARC records

The three records that we examined using the MARC tags all contained generally the same type of information about the Lab Manual for Anatomy and Physiology, but it is the organization of this metadata that proves to be different. When looking at the RDA and two AACR2 MARC tags, one of the biggest differences is the use of abbreviations. The 300 MARC tag is for Physical Description. If looking at the RDA record, 300 b states "illustrations" for other physical details. However, in the AACR2 record and the two AACR2 records, 300 b is notated as "ill." This is due to AACR2 requiring abbreviations while RDA has chosen to rid the bibliographic details of abbreviations. The loss of abbreviations with RDA is intended to make the bibliographic records simpler to understand and to minimize confusion with words that might be abbreviated the same way.

Another difference between the records is the MARC tag 245 for Title Statement. This tag includes the title as well as the copyright date. In the two AACR2 records you will note that in this tag only the copyright date is included: 2006 and 2009. However, in the RDA tag, the year 2011 is notated twice; the reason being that RDA recognizes both the copyright date and the publication date (Schiff 2014). In this case, both the copyright date and publication date match so therefore 2011 is listed twice in that one tag.

In the shift from AACR2 to RDA the access points for which the bibliographic metadata is entered has changed. In RDA there are multiple access points for each source whereas in AACR2 there is the main entry followed by added entries that might be required or not. In RDA there must be the authorized access point followed by access points for relationships to authors, other related works, etc. (Chair 14).

Part 1(b) – What are AACR2 and RDA? What is the transition like from AACR2 to RDA?

In the expansive world of cataloging Metadata, there must be standards applied in order to ensure that throughout different libraries, archives, etc. a record will be able to be easily and successfully accessed by the User. The first set of standards that were applied to the cataloging of Metadata was called the AACR2 (Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed.). As defined by Taylor, AACR2 is "A set of rules, published in 1978, for producing the descriptive and name-and-title access points part of a surrogate record for an information resource…" (p. 441). In layman's terms, AACR2 is the guideline for how sources are organized and cataloged using information about the record such as title, author, publication date, etc. The AACR2 standards are incredibly stringent and follow strict protocol for documenting the metadata of a source. With the shift in technological advances, sources have moved from only basic print to more transcendent pieces such as music files, like MP3s and other internet and online based files. As a result, AACR2 has been unable to adapt to a system that would allow it to continue to catalog these types of sources with its current regulations (Danskin 151). Thus, a new system for cataloging metadata was established.

The AACR2 had been the standard for 30 plus years but in 2009 the RDA system of cataloging was introduced and implemented in the following year. RDA stands for Resource Description and Access and is a new catalog implementation standard that will replace the AACR2 standard. RDA aims to solve issues that the AACR2 failed to see especially in the realm of more technological sources such as CDs, DVDs, MP3s, etc. (Danskin 148). Its cataloging methods are much less strict than AACR2 which allows for more information to be given in the different Metadata subfields. One difference will be that there are no more unnecessary abbreviations included in the metadata fields. When using AACR2, regulations require that editions, names of publishers, and some titles must be abbreviated. This can cause confusion for the User as it can be very difficult to comprehend and decipher what the abbreviations stand for. However, with RDA, the regulations encourage that exact transcription of information into the metadata fields allowing for full titles, names, and publishers to be easily read and distinguishable (Intner 3). RDA

contains a much more flexible set of cataloging regulations allowing for what seems to be a more User-friendly interface.

The transition from AACR2 to RDA has been met with both contention and delight. Transitioning from one set of regulations to another would not have a direct impact on the User per se, but it would affect those responsible for creating the cataloging of the Metadata. Furthermore, transitioning from one set of rules to another will obviously take rigorous training to make sure that RDA is being adopted correctly throughout the Library and Academic fields. There has since been a RDA toolkit published online to provide answers and full RDA MARC records to supply examples to help with the transition (RDA Toolkit 2011). While most seem to welcome the transition to RDA because it will allow for a more flexible system for Sheila Inter she sees the transition to RDA as posing a more serious issue: Splitting the Library and Academic community in two. Intner worries that the RDA principles will only be applied by the institutions that tested it, while the others will continue to use the AACR2 methods which would create a huge chasm between institutions (Intner 8). However, the changes in RDA will not be felt as explicitly in School Library situations as those employees will not actually catalog the bibliographic information for each source (Adamich). As a result, the knowledge of the RDA process will however allow those Librarians to have a deeper understanding of how the MARC records are being organized making it easier to help patrons with specific requests. Another issue that libraries may feel with the transition to RDA is that RDA seems to be trying to fix very minute details when it should be working on the big picture items (Coyle 2007). This would mean focusing on the general rules needed to organize the metatdata and allowing the "special rules" to be decided on by the specific community, for law books or music scores for instance. RDA is however, trying to accomplish and produce a set of instructions for all metadata which will possibly create very specific instructions that will not apply to all sources. Further, it seems that the community that will most be affected would be those involved in the acquisition of records to their libraries due to the new ways in which sources will be cataloged. It will definitely take time to before the LIS community is able to fully incorporate RDA successfully and completely.

Part 2(a) – Dublin Core Record

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>

<metadata

xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"

xmlns:dc="http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/">

<dc:title>Laboratory Manual for Anatomy and Physiology</dc:title>

<dc:creator>Connie Allen, 1945- </dc:creator>

<dc:creator>Valerie Harper</dc:creator>

<dc:subject>Human Anatomy</dc:subject>

<dc:subject>Physiology</dc:subject>

<dc:description> "The Laboratory Manual for Anatomy and Physiology by Allen and Harper presents material in a clear and concise way. It is very interactive and contains activities and experiments that enhance readers' ability to both visualize anatomical structures and understand physiological topics. Lab exercises are designed to require readers to first apply information they learned and then to critically evaluate it. All lab exercises promote group learning and the variety offers learning experiences for all

types of learners (visual, kinesthetic, and auditory). Additionally, the design of the lab exercises makes them easily adaptable for distance learning courses." </dc:description>

<dc:publisher>John Wiley and Sons, Inc</dc:publisher>

<dc:date>2011</dc:date>

<dc:type>text</dc:type>

<dc:identifier>ISBN 0470598905</dc:identifier>

<dc:source>2009 ed. </dc:source>

<dc:source>0470084707</dc:source>

<dc:language>en</dc:language>

<dc:relation>Real Anatomy</dc:relation>

</metadata

Part 2(b) – Compare Dublin Core records

By looking at the Dublin Core record I created and the Standard found on the LoC record it seems that my record seems to have multiple differences in comparison. I used websites such as Amazon.com and Google.com to retrieve information about the Laboratory Manual to create the Metadata used for the Dublin Core Record. The first difference I noted between the two records is the difference in order that the metadata is listed. In order to create my own record I used the Dublin Core User Guide for the list of metadata needed to create a record. In my own record the <dc:language> entry is second to last in my list of metadata but in the official record <dc:language> comes seventh. Furthermore, it seems that my record is consistent with the order that the metadata is listed in on the User Guide whereas the record listed on the LoC is in a different order. Another difference between my record and the LoC record is the specific <dc:publisher> entrant. For <dc:publisher> I have listed John Wiley & Sons as found on the Amazon.com webpage for the Lab Manual. On the LoC record <dc:publisher> is listed as Hoboken, NJ : Wiley. It contains both the city of the publisher as well as the name. The Metadata for <dc:description> however is exactly the same. I took the description from the Amazon.com website Book Description. It seems that the LoC record also took the description from a similar source as it is verbatim. However, one difference is that the LoC record lists the description twice whereas I only have it listed once.

Part 2(c) – How will changes in Metadata Standards affect retrieval?

As a LIS student it has definitely been enlightening to uncover and decipher the workings of how metadata in records is cataloged. It seems that with the many different standards that are used it could become very trying to understand how records are organized. As mentioned above the transition from AACR2 to RDA could create a serious change in how information is retrieved for the User. RDA is being implemented as a simpler way for metadata to be cataloged using a more streamlined pattern of organization. It allows the cataloger to enter an introduction to the source, using individual chapters and elements that contain the bibliographic information (Adamich 12-15). The RDA transition will allow for metadata to be more easily and simply organized by removing some of the more contrived rules such as the number three rule and unnecessary abbreviations. Furthermore, the transition will also be able to be manipulated per the cataloger's choice using the program "MyRDA". This will allow the cataloger to work more closely with the venders to omit and hide certain sections if not needed. As a result, this will allow for more collaboration between the vendors and catalogers to increase the accessibility for specialty

resources such as music and law to be more adaptable in a library setting (Chapman 212). For the User, RDA hopes to increase accessibility and ease in regards to retrieval.

References

1. Adamich, T. (2009). RDA and school libraries: Where are we going and why can't we keep AACR2? *Technicalities*. Vol. 29 Issue 6, p 12-15. Retrieved from: http://web.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.fsu.edu/ehost/detail?sid=6dc75e72-9b92-45c1-837d-9cfce7bb8c40%40sessionmgr4001&vid=1&hid=4209&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=llf&AN=502989345

2. Chapman, A (2010). The case of AACR2 versus RDA. *Legal Information Management*. Vol. 10, pp 210-213. doi:10.1017/S1472669610000721

3. Coyle, K. (2007). Resource description and access: Cataloging rules for the 20th century. *D-Lib Magazine.* Vol. 13, Issue 1. Retrieved from: http://www.dlib.org.proxy.lib.fsu.edu/dlib/january07/coyle/01coyle.html

4. Danskin, A. "Linked and open data: RDA and bibliographic control". JLIS.it. Vol. 4, n. 1 (Gennaio/January 2013): Art: #5463. DOI: 10.4403/jlis.it-5463. Web.

5. Intner, S. (2011). More about the RDA transition. *Library Literature & Information Science*. Vol. 31, Issue 1. Retrieved from: http://web.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.fsu.edu/ehost/detail?vid=2&sid=f9f5ae38-8419-4445-b361-bb1973357536%40sessionmgr110&hid=103&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=llf&AN=503007976

6. Intner, S. (2013). Why implementing RDA is going to be different. *Technicalities*. Pages 6-8. Retrieved from: http://web.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.fsu.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=aa46c7be-8975-4dcf-be3a-ef38941c8a74%40sessionmgr4002&vid=2&hid=4209

7. Schiff, A. *Changes from AACR2 to RDA: A comparison of examples.* (Presentation). Retrieved from http://faculty.washington.edu/aschiff/BCLAPresentationWithNotes-RevMay2011.pdf

8. Taylor, A. (2009). The organization of information. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

9. Quam, E. (2002). Metadata guidelines for dublin core metadata. *Minnesota Department of Natural Resoures*. Retrieved from: http://mn.gov/bridges/bestprac/training.pdf