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Converting VRA Core Records to MARC Records: A Study in Crosswalking

Introduction

Many modern metadata schemes are flexible enough to describe visual resources such as photographs, visual works of art, and digital visual materials. Machine readable cataloging (MARC), Dublin Core, Metadata Object Description Schema, and others are useful in describing these resources. However, one scheme that was designed specifically for visual resources is VRA Core.

VRA Core was created by the Visual Resources Association (VRA) as a “data standard for the description of works of visual culture as well as the images that document them” (VRA, 2013). The full scheme includes 18 elements for metadata entry that describe both the image itself and the work that carries the image. But while VRA Core is a useful and thorough way to describe images, only a small fraction of information organizations use VRA Core to do so.

While use of VRA Core may increase in the coming years, it is not possible to predict how many institutions will adopt this scheme or which institutions will do so. It may also be unlikely that an institution that acquires records created with VRA core will adopt the scheme in the future, and it is certainly unlikely that it will adopt it because of its acquisition of such records. Therefore, it is important to be aware of issues regarding crosswalking of VRA Core to other metadata schemes.

This essay explores the possibility of crosswalking VRA Core records to another metadata scheme, specifically MARC. MARC is one of the most popular schemes in use today;
thus it is likely that any given information organization will use MARC for at least some of its records. It is therefore practical to assume that VRA Core records acquired by an institution will at some point be converted to MARC records. This essay looks into the conversion of VRA Core to MARC, starting with a literature review that covers the history and use of VRA Core and the institutions that use it, as well as a few sample records taken from VRA Core’s Web site and then crosswalked to MARC. It is the goal of the author to demonstrate how crosswalking from VRA Core to MARC is accomplished, and to expose any challenges in the process that must be overcome.

**Literature review**

There are perhaps dozens of metadata schemes that organizations can choose from to effectively describe their collections. One reason for the large number of schemes is that the cataloging and metadata needs of an organization will vary depending on the type of materials handled by the organization. Visual resources are one type of material for which an organization may require a metadata scheme. The metadata needs presented by visual resources will be met most effectively by a scheme that was designed specifically for visual resources. One such scheme is VRA Core, which was designed for visual resources by the Visual Resources Association (VRA).

This literature review will present a brief history and description of VRA Core, followed by a discussion of the importance of assigning metadata to visual resources. The review will then explore the possibility of crosswalking VRA Core to another metadata scheme, specifically machine readable cataloging (MARC), and why such crosswalking might be desirable.

*History and Description of the VRA*
A description and brief history of the VRA can be found on the association’s Web site. The description on the Web site reads:

The Visual Resources Association is a multi-disciplinary organization dedicated to furthering research and education in the field of image management within the educational, cultural heritage, and commercial environments. The Association is committed to providing leadership in the visual resources field, developing and advocating standards, and offering educational tools and opportunities for the benefit of the community at large. The VRA implements these goals through publication programs and educational activities. (VRA, 2007, p. 1)

One of the standards developed by the VRA is VRA Core, a metadata scheme created for the classification and organization of visual materials. Through the development of VRA Core, the association has met some of its goals of creating metadata standards and benefitting the visual resources field.

The history of the VRA is long and somewhat complicated. Given this long, complicated history, the brevity of the story presented on the association’s Web site is a little surprising. The site gives a rather dry account of some visual resources groups that had developed informally in the 1970’s, and then goes on to state:

In 1980, after almost a decade of informal association, visual resources curators active in CAA [the College Art Association] and the Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) began the process of forming an independent organization, which was formalized in the fall of 1982…Bylaws were drawn up and the first official meeting was held during the annual CAA meeting in Philadelphia in February 1983. Members were those curators who subscribed to the Bulletin. (VRA, 2007, p. 2)
Mahard (2003) writes that in the 1970’s, visual resources curators, at the time called slide curators, had established special interest groups within ARLIS/NA that distinguished slide curators from other kinds of information professionals (p. 5). Over time, members of these groups found themselves increasingly alienated from other information professionals within ARLIS/NA.

Issues included a disagreement over whether it was necessary or preferable for slide curators to hold a master’s degree in library science. Most slide curators considered an art history degree to be the only essential degree for their field. At the same time, librarians within ARLIS/NA stressed the importance of the MLS for all members of their organization, causing slide curators to accuse librarians within ARLIS/NA of “library chauvinism” (Mahard, 2003, p. 5-6). Other slide curators felt marginalized by heavy conference time devoted to concerns about the shift to MARC and other automation processes, issues that slide curators felt “were not of utmost concern to them at that time” (Mahard, 2003, p. 5). These issues and others contributed to a growing rift between slide curators and librarians within ALRIS/NA.

The rift culminated in a final, official split between the two groups in 1982. That year, a formal discussion of creating a separate association for slide curators had begun. In August 1982, Dr. Wolfgang Freitag gave a presentation at the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) conference. In it, he discussed the results of an informal survey that indicated only minority support for the establishment of a new association. He closed his presentation with remarks urging a unified library profession (Mahard, 2003, p. 6). Later in the conference, Nancy DeLaurier delivered a speech in which she announced that a separate organization of visual resources curators had been founded and was to be incorporated within a few months. That organization was to become the Visual Resources Association.
DeLaurier’s announcement was unexpected and took many at the conference by surprise (Mahard, 2003, p. 6).

The rift between slide curators and librarians, as well as the somewhat impolitic manner in which the formation of VRA was revealed, sparked a feud between VRA and ARLIS/NA that lasted almost 20 years. The two organizations did not formally set aside their differences until 2001, when they held a joint conference. Freitag (2003) relates that the announcement of this conference left him “dumbfounded, but also very pleased” (p. 4). Although the split and resulting feud may have caused hurt feelings over two decades, Freitag (2003) writes:

This story, although it was, because of the strains of acrimony and contentiousness that accompanied it, certainly not our finest hour, did nevertheless accomplish something positive in that it created the enormous momentum that resulted in the vigorous growth of both VRA and ARLIS/NA. In fact, the growth of the two organizations has strengthened the profession as a whole so that it is stronger today than we could have imagined thirty and twenty years ago. (p. 4).

The story of the founding of the VRA is interesting although slightly unfortunate. The nature of the VRA’s beginnings may be the reason so little of the history is mentioned on the VRA’s Web site. However, it is not only interesting but important to note exactly how the VRA came into existence, given the issues surrounding the divisions among information professionals and how each group approaches their specific profession.

**VRA Core**

VRA Core is a metadata scheme created by the VRA to assist curators in assigning metadata to visual resources. The scheme includes both a work record and an image record. The work record consists of eighteen elements, such as agent, cultural context, description, source,
and subject (VRA, 2012). The image record consists of the same such elements, whose fields may be filled out differently than those of the work record (e.g. using different subject headings). The records and their elements are simple, straightforward, and easy to use, and they relate well to visual resources such as photographs and digital images.

**Metadata and Visual Resources**

According to McRae (2000), “At a time when the abundance of images on the Internet makes access critical, image indexing is beginning to take on greater significance in the larger world of information theory” (p. 4). The rise of the Internet in the last two decades has contributed to an increase in visual media. The findability of these media depends largely on the assignment of metadata to these images. Fry (1998) notes that “Keyword searching rules the Web, but few users understand the complex algorithms which make it possible. As we become creators of these cyber words, do we really know what kind of keywords work best for finding images in this environment?” (p. 51). Although search engines like Google make it relatively easy for searchers to find images via keywords, it still falls on indexers to create the metadata and metadata schemes that will allow searchers to find the most exact images they are looking for. Thus metadata schemes like VRA Core are becoming more useful than ever, as the amount of visual materials rapidly increases alongside the need for precision and accuracy in search results.

Indexers have strived to make access to visual resources easier in the last few decades. Since the adoption of MARC, “new MARC formats [have been] created to allow for more optimal documentation of visually oriented materials within the library community” (Taylor, 1996, p. 17). Originally, MARC was designed for best use with text-based materials. However, emendations were made to MARC in the 1970’s and 80’s in order to allow for better description
of visual materials (Taylor, 1996, p. 18). These “emendations made to the basic MARC format went a long way toward accommodating the special needs of visually oriented materials, especially with regard to aspects of physical description” (Taylor, 1996, p. 18). The changes made to MARC reflect the importance of metadata schemes to visual resources, as well as the importance of accurate and efficient descriptions of visual resources within those schemes.

*Crosswalking VRA Core to MARC*

Although VRA is a convenient and efficient way to assign metadata to visual resources, a study conducted by Park and Tosaka (2010) found that only 14.9% of information organizations (in the researchers’ sample) used VRA Core for some or all of their resources. In contrast, more than 84% of the organizations in the sample used MARC in some form. This is in spite of the fact that 60.1% of the organizations handled images (p. 108). As the authors write, “Results show that MARC, AACR2, and LCSH are the most widely used metadata schema, content standard, and subject controlled vocabulary, respectively. Dublin Core (DC) is the second most widely used metadata schema, followed by EAD, MODS, VRA, and TEI” (p. 104). These data have strong implications for VRA Core, the organizations that use it, and organizations that may wish to use it in the future.

Why did comparatively so few organizations use VRA Core? Although Park and Tosaka’s research was quantitative rather than qualitative, their data does shed some light on organizations’ criteria for selecting certain metadata schemes. In the researchers’ sample group, the two most important factors in selecting metadata schemes were types of resources (60.4%) and target users/audience (49.8%). Other factors included subject matter of resources (46.9%), expertise of staff (44.2%), and the integrated library system (39.9%) (Park & Tosaka, 2010, p. 112). Although a large number of organizations handled images, those same organizations may
have felt that VRA Core did not suit their target users or mesh with the expertise of their staff, among other factors. Therefore, although VRA Core is a viable scheme for describing visual resources, other schemes, most notably MARC, are likely to be used instead.

And that leads to why crosswalking from VRA Core to MARC may be necessary. Since MARC is used more frequently than VRA Core to describe visual resources, it may be prudent at times to convert some VRA Core records to MARC records so that a wider array of organizations will be able to use them. An organization that uses MARC is not likely to also use VRA Core, so if that organization adopts records that were created or used by an organization that uses VRA Core, it will likely be necessary to convert the VRA Core records to MARC. Therefore, a study of the effectiveness of crosswalking from VRA Core to MARC, making note of the challenges and processes involved, is warranted, as some organizations will likely have to convert VRA Core records to the far more popular MARC format.

**Project description**

For this demonstration, I selected five sample VRA Core records and crosswalked them to MARC. The sample records were selected from the list of VRA Core examples on the VRA’s Web site, which is located at http://www.vraweb.org/projects/vracore4/vracore_examplesall.html (retrieved November 2013). The five include records for an ancient megalithic stone circle, a diadem from a jewelry cache, a textual manuscript, a single page from a periodical, and a landscape painting. The records are for both the objects themselves and for the digital images of the objects.

To facilitate the crosswalking process, I utilized the J. Paul Getty Museum’s Metadata Standards Crosswalk, located on the Web at http://www.getty.edu/research/conducting_research/standards/intrometadata/crosswalks.html
(retrieved November 2013). This crosswalk includes fields for twelve metadata schemes, including both VRA Core and MARC. The crosswalk is presented as a simple table with rows and columns, so it is relatively easy to find which elements correspond to one another. However, the table is neither complete nor perfect. Some challenges were presented in using the table to convert VRA Core records to MARC records.

The process for crosswalking presented in the Getty table is very straightforward. Elements are presented in rows beneath columns representing the metadata schemes. The VRA Core column lists all of the elements of VRA Core, which are easily searchable using a browser’s text search function (e.g. CTRL+F). Once an element is found within the VRA column, that element can be cross-referenced in the same row with a similar element in the MARC column. For example, the title element in a VRA Core work record can be referenced with the 245 field of MARC, which is used for title information.

One of the first challenges in crosswalking VRA Core to MARC is that each VRA Core record was actually two records – the work record and the image record. As the cataloger, I had to decide if I should combine the work and image records into one MARC record or create a separate MARC record for each. I decided upon the latter, since it seemed like the simpler idea for this exercise. When searching for each element in the Getty crosswalk, I had to determine whether that element was intended for work records or image records. Fortunately, this was made clear within the crosswalk, as VRA Core elements were followed by notes indicating if the element was specific to works, collections, or images.

Another challenge was knowing what set of rules to use when entering data into the MARC records. The VRA Core records seemed to follow certain entry rules, but it was not clear what these rules were. For the MARC data, I decided to follow Resource Description and
Access (RDA) as closely as possible. This presented additional challenges as I was not aware how RDA handles such situations as a 300 field with no subfield “a”. Should the first letter of subfield “b” be capitalized in this case? I was unsure, so I did not capitalize it. It was also difficult to decide what to enter in fields 336, 337, and 338, as I am not familiar with content, media, and carrier types for physical objects like jewelry and buildings.

Another point of confusion occurred when the crosswalk offered more than one MARC field for one VRA Core element. For example, the VRA Core “location” element was shown as corresponding to MARC fields 651, 655$z, and 752 (with a question mark after 655$z). I had to research each field online and then decide which one to use based on my own discretion. For these records, I found that the 651 field worked best.

In spite of the few challenges, the Getty crosswalk worked quite well for crosswalking the VRA Core records to MARC. This exercise illustrated not only how well the two kinds of records correspond to one another, but also how confusion during crosswalking can be cleared up. With practice, I believe any cataloger can easily convert VRA Core records to MARC for easier record access within an information organization.

Records

On the following pages are the five records mentioned above that were selected from the VRA Web site and their corresponding MARC records.
VRA Core work record – Ancient megalithic stone circle (Example 3)

agent
unknown (European)
culturalContext
European; British
date
[date note] Most recent phase of activity dates to ca. 1550 BCE. ca. 3200 – ca. 1600 BCE (inclusive)
description
Visitors see today the remains of the final stage of Stonehenge, a prehistoric temple used as a place of worship and burial. In its first stage it was a large earthwork—"henge"—a bank and ditch enclosing the Aubrey holes (named after their 17th century discoverer) arranged in a circle. Later (around 2100 BCE) 80 bluestones were brought from the Preseli mountains in Wales and arranged in a double circle in the center. Somewhat later sarsen stones were arranged in an outer circle with continuous lintels and five trilithons were arranged in a horseshoe, the axis of which pointed to the midsummer sunrise. Even later (1550 BCE) the bluestones were rearranged in the horseshoe and circle.
inscription
location
Stonehenge (Wiltshire, England, United Kingdom) [note] on the Salisbury Plain
material
stone; sarsen (sandstone); bluestone
measurements
29.7 m (diameter); 6.7 m (height, tallest stone); 45.2 ton (weight, largest stone)
relation
rights
source
Core 4 Sample Database (VCat)[source, description] Digital Imaging Project; Mary Ann Sullivan, Bluffton University; http://www.bluffton.edu/~sullivanm/ (accessed 2/23/2009)
stateEdition
stylePeriod
Late Bronze Age, Neolithic
subject
timekeeping; Astronomy, Ancient; prehistoric stone circle; megaliths; lunar temple; solar temple; standing stones; religion and mythology; ceremonial site; post-and-lintel construction (assembling)
technique
textref
Stonehenge [en, cited, preferred]
title
buildings; religious buildings; temples; buildings; observatories; built works; monuments
worktype

Image record
agent
Sullivan, Mary Ann
culturalContext
date
description
inscription
location
material
measurements
18 MB
relation
rights
© Mary Ann Sullivan
source
stateEdition
stylePeriod
subject
trilithons, lintels
technique
digital imaging
textref
title
Detail of center axis
worktype
digital image
Visitors see today the remains of the final stage of Stonehenge, a prehistoric temple used as a place of worship and burial. In its first stage it was a large earthwork—"henge"—a bank and ditch enclosing the Aubrey holes (named after their 17th century discoverer) arranged in a circle. Later (around 2100 BCE) 80 bluestones were brought from the Preseli mountains in Wales and arranged in a double circle in the center. Somewhat later sarsen stones were arranged in an outer circle with continuous lintels and five trilithons were arranged in a horseshoe, the axis of which pointed to the midsummer sunrise. Even later (1550 BCE) the bluestones were rearranged in the horseshoe and circle.
VRA work record - Diadem from a jewelry cache (Example 9)

agent unknown (Anatolian)
culturalContext Anatolian
date 1873 (discovery); ca 2500-2000 BCE (creation)
description Sixty-four vertical chains made of double links are suspended from a long narrow band with three perforations at each rounded triangular end. Fifty short chains constitute the central part, and seven long chains frame it at each side. Rhomboid plaques with a raised, perforated central rib are hung on the chains at equal intervals every four links. All the chains have idol-shaped pendants. There are eleven of the rhomboid plaques threaded on to each of the long chains, and just four on each of the short chains. The vertical chains are linked together in the middle by a horizontal chain; the long chains on the side have two additional horizontal plates, one after the second and another after the third row of plaques of the longer parts of the chains. The idol-shaped pendants are decorated with hammered and embossed decoration.

inscription

location Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts (Muzey Izobrazitelnykh Iskusstv Imeni A.S. Pushkina) (Moscow, Rossiya, Rossia) A 5876 [repository] Hisarlik, Marmara, Turkey [discovery] [location note] Probably found within or just outside the walls of Troy II.

material gold
measurements 85.52 gm (weight)
relation formerlyPartOf Priam's Treasure [Core 4 Sample Database, refid="20" relids="w_19"]

rights


stateEdition

stylePeriod Early Bronze Age
subject death or burial; decorative arts; grave goods; jewelry; goldwork

worktype costume (mode of fashion); headgear; headbands (headgear); diadems; jewelry

Image record

agent

culturalContext

date

description

inscription

location History of Art Visual Resources Collection, UC Berkeley, 534929 [repository] [href] http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cgi-bin/havrc_detail?=534929

material

measurements 25.6 kb
relation [imageOf 20, Core 4 Sample Database (VCat)]

source

stateEdition

stylePeriod

subject

textref
title Detail showing pendant ends of long side chains

worktype
digital imaging
Sixty-four vertical chains made of double links are suspended from a long narrow band with three perforations at each rounded triangular end. Fifty short chains constitute the central part, and seven long chains frame it at each side. Rhomboid plaques with a raised, perforated central rib are hung on the chains at equal intervals every four links. All the chains have idol-shaped pendants. There are eleven of the rhomboid plaques threaded on to each of the long chains, and just four on each of the short chains. The vertical chains are linked together in the middle by a horizontal chain; the long chains on the side have two additional horizontal plates, one after the second and another after the third row of plaques of the longer parts of the chains. The idol-shaped pendants are decorated with hammered and embossed decoration.
Drafted by Thomas Jefferson between June 11 and June 28, 1776. The political philosophy of the Declaration was not new; its ideals of individual liberty had already been expressed by John Locke and the Continental philosophers. What Jefferson did was to summarize this philosophy in "self-evident truths" and set forth a list of grievances against the King in order to justify before the world the breaking of ties between the colonies and the mother country.

For full transcription, see http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html. For a list of the 56 signers, see http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_signers_factsheet.html.
MARC work record – Textual manuscript (Example 17)

100 1_ Jefferson, Thomas, 1743-1826.
245 10 Declaration of Independence / Thomas Jefferson.
264 _0 1776
300 $b ink on parchment $c 75.56 x 62.23 cm (width)
336 text $2 rdacarrier
337 unmediated $2 rdamedia
338 sheet $2 rdacarrier
340 calligraphy (process) writing (processes)
500 Drafted by Thomas Jefferson between June 11 and June 28, 1776. The political philosophy of the Declaration was not new; its ideals of individual liberty had already been expressed by John Locke and the Continental philosophers. What Jefferson did was to summarize this philosophy in “self-evident truths” and set forth a list of grievances against the King in order to justify before the world the breaking of ties between the colonies and the mother country.
500 Cultural context: American.
562 For full transcription, see http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html. For a list of the 56 signers, see http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_signers_factsheet.html
581 8_ Core 4 Sample Database (VCat) (source, description) U.S. National Archives and Records Administration (NARA); http://www.archives.gov/ (accessed 2/23/2009)
650 _4 rulers and leaders
typography or calligraphy
650 _4 United States History Revolution, 1775-1783
textual work
650 _4 United States. Continental Congress
650 _4 independence
650 _4 social contract
650 _4 colonies
650 _4 England
650 _4 United States
650 _4 separation
651 _4 National Archives Building (Washington, District of Columbia, United States)[note]
653 _4 Eighteenth century
655 _4 manuscripts (document genre)

Image record

245 00 Overall view of front of parchment / $c [creator not identified].
336 still image $2 rdacarrier
337 computer $2 rdamedia
338 online resource $2 rdacarrier
340 digital imaging $d digital imaging
500 The badly faded original was used to create other printed facsimile copies.
533 still image $e publicDomain
$n U.S. National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_zoom_1.html
787 08 [imageOf 4, Core 4 Sample Database (VCat)]
An example of the new mode of fashion illustration which showed the figures in action, in a genre setting; "rather than simply drawing a mannequin in the outfit, like most previous fashion illustrators, [they] depicted the model in various dramatic and narrative situations."

My invites did not come: Evening gown by Redfern [en, translated, preferred] Mes invités n'arrivent pas: Robe de soirée de Redfern <[fr, inscribed, alternate]
An example of the new mode of fashion illustration which showed the figures in action, in a genre setting: "rather than simply drawing a mannequin in the outfit, like most previous fashion illustrators, [they] depicted the model in various dramatic and narrative situations."

Cultural context: French.

Plate IV from Gazette du Bon Ton, Volume 1, No. 11, September 1913

Digital image

Allan Kohl; Minneapolis College of Art & Design Visual Resource Collection
**Work record - Landscape painting (Example 26)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
<td>Jasper Francis Cropsey (American painter, 1823-1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturalContext</td>
<td>American; British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td>1860 (creation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description</td>
<td>This monumental view of the Hudson River Valley was painted from memory in the artist's London studio. Cropsey adopted a high vantage point, looking southeast toward the distant Hudson River and the flank of Storm King Mountain. A small stream leads from the foreground, where three hunters and their dogs gaze into the sunlight. All along the meandering tributary there are signs of man's peaceful coexistence with nature: a small log cabin, grazing sheep, children playing on a bridge, and cows standing placidly in the water. Here, man neither conquers nor is subservient to nature; both coexist harmoniously. In fact, the landscape is depicted as a ready arena for further agricultural expansion. Cropsey's painting is a celebration of American nationalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscription</td>
<td>lower center: Autumn, -on the Hudson River / J. F Cropsey / London 1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>National Gallery of Art (Washington, District of Columbia, United States) 1963.9.1 (location note) Gift of the Avalon Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material</td>
<td>oil paint on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measurements</td>
<td>151.8 cm (height) x 274.9 cm (width, without frame)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stateEdition</td>
<td>Hudson River school; Nineteenth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stylePeriod</td>
<td>art; Rivers; Hudson River; autumn foliage; trees; leaves; Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td>oil painting (technique)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td>Autumn - On the Hudson River [en, inscribed, preferred]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worktype</td>
<td>paintings (visual works); oil paintings (visual works)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Image record**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturalContext</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscription</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measurements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rights</td>
<td>publicDomain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source</td>
<td>VRA Data Standards Committee, Core 4 Sample Records [href]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://aal.ucsd.edu/vracore4/example011.html">http://aal.ucsd.edu/vracore4/example011.html</a> [source image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Gallery of Art, Washington [website];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nga.gov/home.htm">http://www.nga.gov/home.htm</a> [href]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nga.gov/fcgi-bin/tinfo_f?object=46474">http://www.nga.gov/fcgi-bin/tinfo_f?object=46474</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stateEdition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stylePeriod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technique</td>
<td>digital imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td>Overall view without frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worktype</td>
<td>digital image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This monumental view of the Hudson River Valley was painted from memory in the artist's London studio. Cropsey adopted a high vantage point, looking southeast toward the distant Hudson River and the flank of Storm King Mountain. A small stream leads from the foreground, where three hunters and their dogs gaze into the sunlight. All along the meandering tributary there are signs of man's peaceful coexistence with nature: a small log cabin, grazing sheep, children playing on a bridge, and cows standing placidly in the water. Here, man neither conquers nor is subservient to nature; both coexist harmoniously. In fact, the landscape is depicted as a ready arena for further agricultural expansion. Cropsey's painting is a celebration of American nationalism.
Conclusion

There are many metadata schemes in existence from which information organizations can choose when developing their information catalogs. Some are more common than others, and MARC happens to be one of the most common. VRA Core is less common, but does have its place within the sphere of information organization. If a library or other organization acquires a set of VRA Core records and would prefer to have those records in MARC format, the process for crosswalking is, as shown above, quite simple, straightforward, and efficient. Problems and challenges, while initially inevitable, should be easily overcome and the resulting MARC records should be satisfactory for the organization’s needs.
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