



Original Article

From Cutter to Dublin Core: A Critical Analysis of Resource Description Standards

Riti Goswami¹, Snigdha Naskar²

^{1,2}Department of Library & Information Science, Rabindra Bharati University

Manuscript ID:

IBMIRJ -2026-030802

Submitted: 08 July 2026

Revised: 17 July 2026

Accepted: 05 Aug..2026

Published: 31 Aug. 2026

ISSN: 3065-7857

Volume-3

Issue-8

Pp. 7-11

August 2026

Correspondence Address:

Snigdha Naskar

Department of Library & Information Science, Rabindra Bharati University

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1960-4591>

Email: snigdha.2rbu@gmail.com



Quick Response Code:



Web: <https://ibrj.us>



DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22304112

DOI Link:

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22304112>



Creative Commons

Abstract

Resource description standards have evolved from nineteenth-century cataloguing codes designed for physical collections to flexible metadata frameworks supporting digital and networked environments. This article critically examines the theoretical trajectory from Charles Ammi Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue* (1876) to the *Dublin Core Metadata Element Set* (1995) and subsequent developments including FRBR, RDA, and BIBFRAME. Drawing on historical documentary analysis, the study identifies both continuity—particularly in user-centred objectives of finding, identifying, selecting, and obtaining resources—and significant transformations driven by technological change, interoperability demands, and the shift from record-based to entity-relationship models. Critical evaluation reveals strengths in progressive adaptation and enduring principles of bibliographic control, alongside limitations such as persistent complexity in traditional codes, under-adoption of simple metadata schemes, and challenges in achieving true semantic interoperability. The analysis demonstrates that modern standards do not replace classical principles but reinterpret them for digital contexts. Implications for hybrid library environments and future linked-data systems are discussed.

Keywords: knowledge organisation, resource description, cataloguing codes, Dublin Core, Cutter's Rules, metadata standards, FRBR, RDA, bibliographic control, interoperability

Introduction

Resource description is a central component of knowledge organisation because it determines how information resources are identified, represented, accessed, and retrieved. The history of cataloguing and metadata demonstrates a gradual transformation from rule-based systems developed primarily for physical library collections to flexible and interoperable frameworks designed for digital and networked environments. Nineteenth-century cataloguing theorists established many of the principles that continue to influence contemporary resource description. Among them, Charles Ammi Cutter made a particularly significant contribution through his *Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue* (1876), which articulated clear user-centred objectives of enabling users to find, collocate, and select resources. These principles provided an important theoretical foundation for later cataloguing codes and bibliographic standards. During the twentieth century, developments such as AACR, AACR2, MARC, and ISBD responded to the need for greater standardisation, international cooperation, and machine-readable bibliographic records. The emergence of digital resources and the World Wide Web, however, created new requirements that traditional catalogue structures could not adequately address. Dublin Core, introduced in 1995, represented a major shift toward simplified, flexible, and cross-domain metadata description. Subsequent developments such as FRBR, RDA, and BIBFRAME further extended resource description toward entity-relationship modelling, linked data, and Semantic Web environments. This article critically examines this historical trajectory to identify both the continuity of classical bibliographic principles and their transformation within contemporary metadata systems.

Research Questions

1. How the core principles of resource description evolved from Cutter's cataloguing rules to the Dublin Core metadata schema and later frameworks?
2. What theoretical foundations underpin this evolution, and where do continuities and ruptures appear?

Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Public License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/), which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

How to cite this article:

Goswami, R., & Naskar, S. (2026). From Cutter to Dublin Core: A Critical Analysis of Resource Description Standards. *InSight Bulletin: A Multidisciplinary Interlink International Research Journal*, 3(8), 7–11. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22304112>

3. In what ways do Cutter's objectives of the catalogue correspond to the functional requirements and elements of Dublin Core and subsequent models such as FRBR and RDA?
4. What role has technological developments and conceptual shifts played in redefining bibliographic control and description practices?
5. What critical implications does this transition hold for contemporary and future knowledge organisation in digital and hybrid environments?

Objectives

1. To trace the historical and theoretical development of resource description standards from the era of Cutter to the digital metadata age.
2. To analyse Cutter's contributions and assess their continuing relevance within modern metadata contexts.
3. To examine the conceptual framework and structural features of the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set.
4. To compare traditional cataloguing principles with digital metadata standards, identifying strengths, limitations, and points of tension.
5. To identify patterns of continuity and transformation in key ideas such as user convenience, access, interoperability, and bibliographic control.
6. To contribute a critical theoretical understanding of how resource description standards adapt to changing technological and informational environments.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative historical and documentary research design. Primary sources include Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue* and official documentation of the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative. Secondary sources comprise major cataloguing codes, bibliographic standards, and metadata frameworks (Panizzi's 91 Rules, Jewett's Rules, Anglo-American Code 1908, Vatican Code, Ranganathan's Classified Catalogue Code, ALA Codes, AACR/AACR2, MARC, FRBR, RDA, and BIBFRAME), together with scholarly analyses drawn from peer-reviewed literature. Data collection relied on authoritative academic databases and published standards documents. Analysis proceeded through theoretical, content, and comparative methods. A chronological mapping of standards was constructed to identify shifts in focus, entry elements, and underlying principles. Interpretive analysis examined philosophical and epistemological foundations, while critical evaluation assessed each standard's capacity to meet user needs, support interoperability, and adapt to technological change. The approach is conceptual rather than empirical; no primary fieldwork or library-system data were collected. References follow APA 7th edition style. The documentary design is appropriate to the research questions because the study concerns the evolution of principles, models, and standards rather than the measured performance of a particular library system. At the same time, this methodological choice establishes a necessary limitation. The study can identify conceptual continuity, historical transformation, and documented implementation challenges, but it cannot demonstrate that one standard produces superior retrieval outcomes without empirical testing. The findings should therefore be understood as theoretically and historically grounded conclusions rather than causal claims concerning system performance.

Literature Review

Scholarship on resource description consistently frames knowledge organisation as a dynamic field shaped by user needs, technological innovation, and institutional cooperation. Miksa (2021) traces cataloguing principles from Panizzi and Cutter through the International Cataloguing Principles, AACR, and RDA, emphasising the growing influence of FRBR and the Library Reference Model in producing more flexible, user-oriented approaches. Gorman (2000) provides a broad twentieth-century overview, highlighting the progression from cooperative initiatives and Lubetzky's critiques to MARC, ISBD, and the rise of OPACs and WebPACs. Chandel and Prasad (2013) and Dobreski (2021) position descriptive cataloguing as fundamentally user-serving rather than perfectionist, noting RDA's metadata-oriented flexibility while acknowledging varied professional responses to its adoption. Madumali and Wanigasooriya (2024) document the shift from physical description toward content- and access-oriented elements for non-print materials. On the transition from AACR2 to RDA, Howarth and Weihs (2007) and Harden (2012) emphasise the inadequacy of card-catalogue assumptions in digital environments and the conceptual centrality of FRBR user tasks. Tosaka and Park (2014, 2018) reveal uneven professional readiness for RDA, Semantic Web technologies, and BIBFRAME, highlighting disparities between large research institutions and smaller libraries. Blanco-Olea (2025) quantifies the gradual rather than abrupt replacement of older standards in scholarly literature. Dublin Core literature stresses simplicity and interoperability. The standardised DCMES consists of fifteen core elements (Dublin Core Metadata Initiative [DCMI], 2012), while Coleman (2005) and Bhatnagar (2008) present Dublin Core as a practical extension of traditional cataloguing suitable for web resources. Wagner and Weibel (2005) examine metadata registries as infrastructure for consistency and reuse. Critical voices note limited actual implementation on the open web (Phelps, 2012) and persistent difficulties in teaching high-quality metadata creation (Zavalina & Burke, 2021). Riley (2023) situates descriptive metadata within broader debates on bias, representation, and critical practice.

Emerging work on linked data and Semantic Web technologies (Gaitanou et al., 2024; Monyela, 2022) argues that traditional closed-catalogue models are insufficient for open, interconnected environments. Alemu (2016) proposes metadata enriching and filtering through professional-user collaboration. Collectively, the literature demonstrates continuity of core principles alongside a clear movement from institution-centred, rule-heavy description toward flexible, relationship-based, and machine-actionable frameworks. Gaps remain in critical evaluation of how fully classical objectives survive translation into simple metadata schemes and in empirical assessment of interoperability outcomes across cultural heritage domains. A significant distinction emerging from the literature is that the standards included in this historical sequence do not operate at an identical

conceptual or technical level. FRBR is principally a conceptual model, RDA functions as a content standard, MARC provides a machine-readable encoding and communication structure, Dublin Core constitutes a metadata vocabulary, and BIBFRAME provides a linked-data model. Treating these developments simply as successive cataloguing codes would therefore obscure the nature of the transformation. Their evolution is better understood as a progressive differentiation of the functions required for resource description: rules governing description, conceptual structures representing entities and relationships, vocabularies expressing metadata, and technological models enabling data exchange and linking increasingly operate as interrelated but distinct layers (IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, 1998; Library of Congress, 2016; RDA Steering Committee, n.d.).

Data Collection and Analysis

Data consist of the principal resource description standards that mark the historical trajectory. Each is examined for historical context, objectives, structural features, guiding principles, contributions, and limitations. Early codes established foundational practices. Panizzi's 91 Rules (1841) introduced systematic author entry, uniform headings, and the concept of the main entry, prioritising the collocation of an author's works. Jewett's Rules (1852) advanced cooperative cataloguing and clarified corporate authorship, while preferring first-word title entry for anonymous works. Cutter's *Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue* (1876, final edition 1904) broadened the scope dramatically by incorporating subject and form entries and articulating explicit catalogue objectives: to enable a user to find a book of which the author, title, or subject is known; to show what the library has by a given author, on a given subject, or in a given kind of literature; and to assist in the choice of a book as to its edition or character. Cutter's insistence that "the convenience of the public is always to be set before the ease of the cataloguer" remains a touchstone (Cutter, 1904, p. 6). Continental European codes (Dziatzka 1886; Prussian Instructions 1899) rejected corporate authorship and favoured grammatical title arrangement, illustrating that bibliographic principles are culturally contingent. The Anglo-American Code (1908) and Vatican Code (1931) represented early international collaboration and comprehensive coverage of entry, description, subject headings, and filing. Ranganathan's Classified Catalogue Code (1934–1964) introduced scientific canons, chain indexing, and economy of description, integrating classification and cataloguing more tightly than most Western codes.

Mid-twentieth-century developments (ALA 1941 and 1949) refined author–title rules but attracted criticism for excessive detail (Osborn's "Crisis in Cataloguing"). MARC (developed 1965–1968, standardised thereafter) transformed textual records into machine-readable fields, tags, indicators, and subfields, enabling automated exchange while remaining largely neutral with respect to content rules. AACR (1967) and AACR2 (1978, revised 1988 and 2002) incorporated ISBD punctuation and expanded coverage of non-book materials, yet retained a record-centric, card-catalogue inheritance. Dublin Core (1995) marked a deliberate simplification. The fifteen core elements—Title, Creator, Subject, Description, Publisher, Contributor, Date, Type, Format, Identifier, Source, Language, Relation, Coverage, and Rights—prioritise cross-domain interoperability, ease of creation, and commonly understood semantics. Qualified Dublin Core later added refinements. FRBR (1998) introduced an entity-relationship model centred on user tasks (Find, Identify, Select, Obtain) and the Work–Expression–Manifestation–Item hierarchy (IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, 1998). RDA (2010) operationalised FRBR/FRAD/FRSAD principles for both analogue and digital resources and was designed with linked-data compatibility in mind. BIBFRAME (2012, version 2.0 2016) further reconceptualised bibliographic data as linked entities (Work, Instance, Item, plus Agents, Subjects, Events) expressed through Semantic Web technologies (Library of Congress, 2016). Historically, the first Dublin Core workshop formulation in 1995 contained thirteen elements, with the now-familiar fifteen-element set emerging subsequently and entering formal standardisation in 1998 (DCMI, n.d., 2012). This clarification strengthens rather than weakens the argument regarding simplification. Dublin Core developed as a deliberately small, generic discovery vocabulary whose principal value lay in cross-domain usability rather than in reproducing the descriptive granularity of professional library cataloguing. Comparative analysis reveals a progressive shift from author-centred, rule-prescriptive description of physical items toward entity-based, relationship-rich, and machine-actionable representation of diverse resources. Entry elements expanded from author/title to include subject, form, and later a wide array of attributes and relationships. Focus moved from local bibliographic control to networked interoperability. Yet critical tensions persist: traditional codes achieved high consistency at the cost of complexity and slow adaptation; Dublin Core achieved simplicity and uptake in repositories but often at the expense of semantic precision and controlled vocabulary discipline; FRBR/RDA/BIBFRAME offer theoretical elegance but impose steep learning curves and infrastructural demands that many institutions have struggled to meet fully.

The comparison further demonstrates that technological change alone cannot explain this evolution. MARC principally made bibliographic data machine-readable and exchangeable; it did not itself determine the intellectual rules governing what information should be recorded. Dublin Core altered the conditions and scale of metadata creation by enabling relatively lightweight description across domains. FRBR changed the conceptual understanding of the bibliographic universe by foregrounding entities, relationships, and user tasks, while RDA translated relational principles into descriptive instructions. BIBFRAME subsequently moved bibliographic representation toward a linked-data environment (Library of Congress, 2016). The trajectory is therefore not simply a movement from "old" standards to "new" standards, but from the relatively self-contained catalogue record toward a layered and interconnected metadata ecosystem.

Findings

The evolution of resource description standards exhibits both remarkable continuity and necessary transformation. Cutter's objectives map closely onto FRBR user tasks and remain implicit in Dublin Core's design for resource discovery. Principles of standardised description, authority control, and collocation persist, even when realised through different technical means—from uniform headings to unique identifiers and linked-data graphs. The correspondence between Cutter and FRBR should, however, be interpreted as functional rather than as a literal one-to-one equivalence. Cutter's "find" objective corresponds

most directly to FRBR's Find task; his concern with showing what a library possesses supports the related functions of collocation and identification; and his "choice" objective substantially anticipates Select. FRBR's Obtain task extends the model more explicitly towards gaining access to or acquiring the resource. This distinction demonstrates both inheritance and conceptual expansion. Later models retain the user-centred logic embodied in Cutter's objectives while extending it to the conditions of networked access and digital resource delivery (Cutter, 1904; IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, 1998). Critical examination, however, exposes limitations. Early codes, while pioneering, were often institution-specific and insufficiently attentive to subject access or non-book materials. AACR2's detailed rules, though internationally successful, became increasingly cumbersome in digital environments and retained legacy assumptions about fixed bibliographic records. Dublin Core's simplicity facilitated rapid adoption in digital libraries and repositories, yet its minimalism has been criticised for inadequate expressiveness in specialised domains and for uneven quality in practice (Zavalina & Burke, 2021; Phelps, 2012). FRBR and RDA reoriented cataloguing around user tasks and entities, yet implementation has been uneven, particularly outside large research libraries (Tosaka & Park, 2014). BIBFRAME promises greater integration of bibliographic information with linked-data environments, but migration from established MARC infrastructures entails technical and organisational costs (Blanco-Olea, 2025; Library of Congress, 2016).

These limitations support a second major finding: **simplicity and interoperability are related but are not synonymous**. A small common element set can make metadata easier to produce and exchange, but semantic interoperability additionally depends upon consistent values, controlled vocabularies, identifiers, mappings, and application profiles. Consequently, Dublin Core's minimalism addresses the cost and portability of basic description, but specialised communities may require greater semantic precision. Metadata registries and linked-data approaches seek to reduce this gap by making metadata definitions and relationships more explicit and reusable (Gaitanou et al., 2024; Wagner & Weibel, 2005). A further critical observation concerns the incomplete realisation of interoperability. While standards successively improved data exchange, true semantic interoperability across libraries, archives, museums, and the open web remains partial. Cultural and linguistic biases embedded in controlled vocabularies and descriptive practices also persist, as recent critical metadata scholarship notes (Riley, 2023). Thus, technological interoperability does not automatically produce neutral or universally adequate knowledge representation. The intellectual and cultural choices involved in description continue to matter even when records are expressed as linked data.

The evidence also indicates that transitions between standards are cumulative rather than abrupt. Blanco-Olea (2025) demonstrates continued scholarly engagement with both older and newer standards during periods of transition, while Tosaka and Park (2014, 2018) show that professional preparation and institutional capacity influence implementation. This helps explain the persistence of hybrid environments in which legacy MARC records, RDA descriptions, Dublin Core repository metadata, and emerging BIBFRAME structures may coexist. Such coexistence need not be interpreted simply as failed modernisation. It can result from migration costs, existing infrastructure, requirements for professional retraining, system compatibility, and the need to preserve substantial historical investment in bibliographic data. Nevertheless, the trajectory demonstrates adaptive capacity. Each major standard responded to perceived shortcomings of its predecessors—cooperative needs, automation, digital proliferation, linked-data environments—while retaining the fundamental commitment to making resources findable and usable. Modern metadata frameworks are therefore best understood not as ruptures but as reinterpretations of classical bibliographic principles under new technological and social conditions. Taken together, these findings justify an interpretation of the history of resource description as **cumulative adaptation**. Bibliographic principles survive not because particular rules remain unchanged, but because the purposes underlying them continue to be reformulated through new descriptive structures and technologies. User convenience becomes user-task modelling; collocation becomes explicit entity relationships; standardisation develops into machine-processable vocabularies and identifiers; and cooperative cataloguing expands into networked and linked-data interoperability. Continuity is therefore most visible at the level of purpose, whereas transformation is most visible at the level of structure, technology, and implementation.

Conclusions

Resource description standards from Cutter to Dublin Core and beyond illustrate a continuous negotiation between enduring theoretical commitments and changing technological possibilities. Cutter's user-centred objectives and emphasis on consistent access points provided a durable conceptual foundation that subsequent codes and metadata schemes have successively operationalised for card catalogues, machine-readable records, web resources, and linked-data environments. Dublin Core's deliberate minimalism addressed the scale and heterogeneity of digital information in ways that traditional cataloguing could not, yet it also revealed the limits of extreme simplification. Later models—FRBR, RDA, and BIBFRAME—have sought to recover relational richness and machine actionability while remaining compatible with earlier data. Critical analysis suggests that the field's strength lies in this cumulative adaptation rather than in any single standard. Challenges remain: complexity versus usability, local consistency versus global interoperability, professional control versus participatory enrichment, and the translation of theoretical elegance into sustainable operational practice. Future development is likely to involve further integration with Semantic Web technologies, artificial intelligence for metadata generation and enrichment, and more inclusive approaches to representation. The fundamental purpose—organising recorded knowledge so that it can be effectively discovered and used—has remained constant. Contemporary and future standards will succeed to the extent that they continue to honour that purpose while responding rigorously to the informational and technological conditions of their time.

The analysis also cautions against interpreting this history as a simple replacement narrative. RDA itself has continued to evolve, with the official version released after the 3R Project integrating the IFLA Library Reference Model, while BIBFRAME continues the movement toward representing bibliographic information through linked data (Library of Congress, 2016; RDA Steering Committee, n.d.). The future of resource description may therefore depend less upon identifying a single universal record

format than upon establishing reliable semantic relationships among heterogeneous systems. Viewed from this perspective, Cutter's most enduring contribution is not an individual nineteenth-century rule but the principle underlying his catalogue objectives: bibliographic description has value insofar as it enables users to discover, distinguish, select, access, and use recorded knowledge effectively.

Acknowledgements of financial or research assistance:

I certify that no funding has been received for research or/and publication.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

1. Alemu, G. (2016). A theory of metadata enriching and filtering. *Libri*, 66(4), 251–262. <https://doi.org/10.1515/libri-2016-0109>
2. Bhatnagar, A. (2008). Dublin Core (DC) metadata: A techno-savvy approach of traditional cataloguing. In *Proceedings of the 6th International CALIBER 2008: From automation to transformation* (pp. 232–246). INFLIBNET Centre.
3. Blanco-Olea, F. (2025). Evolution of 21st century scientific production indexed in Web of Science on old and new cataloging standards. *JLIS.it*, 16(1), 90–107. <https://doi.org/10.36253/jlis.it-627>
4. Chandel, A. S., & Prasad, R. V. (2013). Journey of catalogue from Panizzi's principles to Resource Description and Access. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 33(4), 314–322. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.33.5007>
5. Coleman, A. S. (2005). From cataloging to metadata: Dublin Core records for the library catalog.
6. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 40(3–4), 153–181. https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v40n03_08
7. Cutter, C. A. (1904). *Rules for a dictionary catalog* (4th ed., rewritten). U.S. Government Printing Office.
8. (Original work published 1876)
9. Dobreski, B. (2021). Descriptive cataloging: The history and practice of describing library resources.
10. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 59(2–3), 225–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2020.1864693>
11. Dublin Core Metadata Initiative. (n.d.). *Dublin Core™*. <https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core/>
12. Dublin Core Metadata Initiative. (2012). *Dublin Core Metadata Element Set, version 1.1: Reference description*. <https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core/dces/>
13. Gaitanou, P., Andreou, I., Sicilia, M.-A., & Garoufallou, E. (2024). Linked data for libraries: Creating a
14. global knowledge space, a systematic literature review. *Journal of Information Science*, 50(1), 204–244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515221084645>
15. Gorman, M. (2000). *From card catalogues to WebPACs: Celebrating cataloguing in the 20th century*. Library of Congress.
16. Harden, J. (2012). Cataloguing in 2012: On the cusp of RDA. *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 59(3), 249–256.
17. Howarth, L. C., & Weihs, J. (2007). Making the link: AACR to RDA: Part 1: Setting the stage.
18. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 45(2), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v45n02_02
19. IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. (1998). *Functional requirements for bibliographic records: Final report*. K. G. Saur.
20. Library of Congress. (2016, April 21). *Overview of the BIBFRAME 2.0 model*.
21. <https://www.loc.gov/bibframe/docs/bibframe2-model.html>
22. Madumali, P. B. I., & Wanigasooriya, P. (2024). Using cataloguing rules for effective organization of
23. bibliographical information of non-book materials: A systematic literature review. *Multidisciplinary Desk Research Conference*. <https://doi.org/10.64920/drc2024047>
24. Miksa, S. D. (2021). Cataloging principles and objectives: History and development. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 59(2–3), 97–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2021.1883173>
25. Monyela, M. (2022). Knowledge organisation in academic libraries: The linked data approach. In *Innovative technologies for enhancing knowledge access in academic libraries* (pp. 71–88). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-3364-5.ch005>
26. Phelps, T. E. (2012). An evaluation of metadata and Dublin Core use in web-based resources. *Libri*, 62(4), 326–335. <https://doi.org/10.1515/libri-2012-0025>
27. RDA Steering Committee. (n.d.). *RDA frequently asked questions*. RDA Toolkit. https://www.rdatoolkit.org/rsc/content/rda_faq
28. Riley, J. (2023). Understanding the role of metadata in a digital repository. In L. Woolcott & A. Shiri (Eds.), *Discoverability in digital repositories: Systems, perspectives, and user studies*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003216438-5>
29. Tosaka, Y., & Park, J.-R. (2014). RDA: Training and continuing education needs in academic libraries.
30. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 55(1), 3–25.
31. Tosaka, Y., & Park, J.-R. (2018). Continuing education in new standards and technologies for the organization of data and information: A report on the cataloging and metadata professional development survey. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 62(1), 4–19. <https://doi.org/10.5860/lrts.62n1.4>
32. Wagner, H., & Weibel, S. (2005). The Dublin Core metadata registry: Requirements, implementation, and experience. *Journal of Digital Information*, 6(2).
33. Zavalina, O. L., & Burke, M. (2021). Assessing skill building in metadata instruction: Quality evaluation of Dublin Core metadata records created by graduate students. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 62(4), 423–442. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jelis.62-4-2020-0083>