Олимпиада НИУ ВШЭ для студентов и выпускников – 2018 г.

Демонстрационный вариант и методические рекомендации по направлению «Медиакоммуникации»

ДЕМОНСТРАЦИОННЫЙ ВАРИАНТ

Профиль: «Менеджмент в СМИ» **КОД - 280**

Время выполнения задания – 180 мин., язык – русский.

Прочитайте предложенную статью и напишите рецензию на нее, стараясь придерживаться списка вопросов, приведенных в конце статьи.

What's So Special About Public Service Media Management?

Christian S. Nissen
Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

The market position of Public Service Media (PSM) and the programming and services provided have for years been the object of academic media research. Relatively little has however been written about the way the PSM corporations are managed. The article presents a number of reasons why media management researchers should add this area to their field of study. Not only are the managers of PSM corporations in great need of scholarly inspiration from outside. Even more important from an academic perspective is the fact that PSM provides management researchers with a sample of reasonably comparable cases of media companies and managers exposed to radical and very similar changes in their operational environment.

Much has been written about the remit of public service media (PSM), its relations to government, program output, and market performance relative to commercial media. The relatively strong, if increasingly contentious, position of the publicly owned media corporations in today's liberalized European media markets is a peculiarity and attracts attention from private competitors
and public regulators, as well as academic observers, as the RIPE initiative illustrates.1 Whether one regards PSM organizations as obsolete dinosaurs from the period of broadcast monopoly or looks upon them as guardians of civic enlightenment sustaining societal coherence, their role and performance are of understandable commercial concern and obvious public and academic interest.
How they are managed has, so far, apparently, been a less tempting area of study. Inside the public media sector there is scarce demand for scholarly insight about its management: a topic often seen either as an intrusive diversion or as superfluous to Reithian2 ideals. Second, from an academic perspective, one can ask if PSM management is unique enough to merit specific attention. The theme of the European Media Management Association's 2012 Budapest conference was a fruitful provocation. Inspired by that, my purpose is to provide a few preliminary answers to a question rooted in that theme: What's so special about the management of PSM that makes it a worthy focus for scholarly research?

Why study PSM management?

This question implies that researchers have rational, systematic reasons for choosing what to study. In practice, many very interesting and fruitful management studies have a narrower intention and are the result of circumstance and accident. Simple curiosity is a good starting point. Management researchers, and others too, can justify their field of study and choice of object with the same answer that George Mallory, the British mountaineer, gave when asked

why he was so determined to climb Mount Everest: "Because it's there!" PSM is a mountainous landscape of spectacular views and blanketed with contradictions, challenges, and conflicts that beg to be understood and explained. One does not need any more specific research mission.

That said, there are good reasons for pursuing systematic approaches to the study of PSM management. The first that comes to my mind lies in the real potential for general management studies to optimize understanding of how PSM organizations operate and are managed. In light of the relatively low priority given to this area of research, there is a lot of unexploited potential for insight that would be valuable, both for PSM organizations and the stakeholder environments. Considering management as an explanatory variable will surely cast new light on strategic choices and the daily operations of PSM organizations. This is to encourage studying the usual elements of management research, such as organizational culture and structure, workflow, steering and control mechanism, human resource and financial management, and so on. In my experience, many PSM insiders consider these as external factors outside the "core business" of program production, distribution, and consumption. That perspective in itself often makes PSM organizations difficult to manage. The second good reason to pursue a systematic approach is that PSM offers an interesting laboratory by providing a manageable sample of comparable cases. The number of PSM actors is relatively small. This should make it possible to arrive at conclusions with a more general applicability than one could otherwise hope to achieve. Although PSM is certainly distinctive in key aspects when compared with other media, as I come to shortly, it is a "star" in the same organizational "galaxy" as the rest of the "constellation" of media businesses, many of which are the objects of management studies.

What is so special about PSM?

It is useful to observe some of distinctive characteristics of this sector in media as another reason for research. Public service broadcasting (PSB) was established in Europe during the first half of the 20th century. Although variants have evolved in other parts of the world, the European model is generally considered the "basic or ideal" way of organizing publicly owned media companies. But, in fact, and even within Europe, there are interesting differences when we compare across countries and organizations. The 80-odd members of the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) provide a compelling picture of a sector that is organized and operated quite differently in the Northern region compared with the South, and in the West compared with the East. Those differences are significant, and they are determined by varied historical experiences, as well cultural and economic conditions. At the same time and while taking that into account, one can ascertaincharacteristic features as well:

- Publicly owned institution.
- Non-profit orientation.
- Obligations of a sociocultural and pro-democracy nature (the remit).
- A controversial balance between public ownership and regulation, on the
- one side, and on the other, the ideal of editorial autonomy.
- A funding model based on public funding methods, often combined with
- advertising income.
- A significant actor in domestic markets, with a relatively large proportion
- of originated content.

This ideal typology not only helps describe PSM in general, but also highlights important features that differentiate the sector—to return to the earlier point. The typical focus in management literature is on economic performance outcomes in a market and the effects of ownership structures on media content. This has limited relevance in studies of PSM organizations, which are not even "companies" in the traditional sense. Each point on this short list arguably calls for a "customized" approach to the study of PSM management, at least in comparison to typical management studies that are concerned with other priorities. Each

distinction places special demands on management responsibilities: elements that are seldom prioritized in commercial companies and, for some points, even entirely absent. This should encourage comparative studies about the differences in operational conditions between public and private media and how they influence the
way companies in the two sectors are managed.

Publish media – meeting the market

One significant challenge in conducting comparative studies of systems as complex as media organizations and their relations to markets *and* societies is the difficulty of "keeping all other things equal." Most social scientists have now and then (perhaps secretly) dreamt of the possibility to work with an equation where only one independent variable (e.g., developments in the market) can be changed to clearly ascertain the affect of that on the "other side" of the equation (i.e., diverse dependent variables). The studies of media organizations and systems, and their management, have not (so far) encouraged any realistic expectation of realizing such dreams. However, I would suggest that Public Service Media provides a unique opportunity that is not, so far, removed from a laboratory-type experiment, as hinted at earlier. Here, I am alluding to the abolition of PSB's monopoly status, which happened all over Europe in a short period at the end of the 20th century. Meanwhile, in eastern Europe, the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s launched an abrupt transition of media systems there. This involved the wholesale introduction of commercial media and efforts to transform the former state broadcasters (also monopolies) into "public broadcasters." That is a contemporary project of great importance. In western Europe, commercial broadcasting was established more gradually over a couple of decades, allowing privately owned companies to find their feet and the market system to emerge more adaptively. Both in the East and the West, this led to an abrupt drop in the market share for the former monopolies, which threatened their mandatory roles as broadcasters for the entire public. For most top managers, as well as the rank and file of PSM program makers, who had grown accustomed for decades to uninterrupted work life in splendid isolation from "disturbing" market forces, these changes came as a shock. After a period of disbelief, the counter-strike chosen with varying degrees of alertness, strength, and success has been a long line of controversial, successive changes: channel profiling, management by scheduling, program commissioning, production flows, organizational structures, redistribution of budgets, the transparency of cost structures, and even (gasp!) marketing; and all of that in the context of digitalization and convergence—processes in which this sector has usually had a pivotal role. These changes were controversial in house because they challenged established practices based on legacy norms and values. They were (rightly) seen as a consequence of a new managerial culture taking over. What some defined as modernity (at long last) was experienced by others as suffocating bureaucracy and the loss of creative liberties, enacted by unqualified barbarians who lacked a proper respect for and understanding of public service as culture, practice, and history. Depending on the case, both perspectives are valid. However one sees this, and regardless of how profound or successful the reforms, it is a field now begging for deeper insights, clearer explanations, and useful answers to a range of relevant questions. Those include, for example, the following:

● Is it true, as claimed, that the wave of management changes was primarily caused by external forces: by the emergence of the competitive media market?; or were other (independent) variables at work? What role did the tighter and (European Union-) harmonized regime of public regulation play? What were the effects of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-sponsored New Public Management paradigm that was introduced during the same period?

● PSM organizations reacted differently. Some changed at their own initiative, and some only changed when forced to do so, and some rather less than one might imagine. How can the differences be explained? Why did the most profound changes seemingly take place in the northwest corner of Europe? Could that explain why PSM companies in this region have been

reasonably successful in keeping their position both in the market and in society?

● On the other hand, what explains the many similarities in the over all change pattern? Did all (or most of the) PSM top managers spontaneously make roughly the same diagnosis and recommend the same cure?, or was this because a new generation of managers were recruited from the outside in a rapidly developing business environment, with personal experience in market competition and organizational change? What role, if any, did internal contacts among PSM executives in the context of the EBU assemblies and regional summits among professionals play?

● Do the described managerial changes and general patterns correspond with experience in other industries suddenly faced with the need for radical change? The last question on what is admittedly a sketchy list has special relevance due to the fact that all media businesses (including PSM) are now exposed to challenges from their environments that are more profound and radical even than the abolition of the public media monopoly 20 years ago.

Digitalithation – another reason for managerial turnaround

Few, if any, technological innovations since Gutenberg's press have had an impact on media and in society communication as radical as digital technology. The Internet has been the "great disrupter," challenging the business models of every established platform (newspapers, film, the recording industry, telephony, television, radio, etc.). Not only are they migrating toward one integrated, nonlinear, online distribution platform, they are merging in the way content and services are produced and used by the audiences, and struggling over how to ensure revenues and margins. The need for innovation in business models and revenue streams is probably the most difficult problem to tackle. Without going into details, some managerial consequences of digitalization changes can be illustrated. Concerning the external media market, there are (although developing at a slower speed than many have expected) reasons to believe that the traditional "mass media market" served by generalist television channels will gradually lose ground (share) due to a multiplicity of niche channels. That is even more likely due to the erosion of simultaneity in consumption and the growing individualization of usage caused by interactive options, ondemand delivery, Internet Protocol television, personal video recorders, and other options. This change in the basic, essential media paradigm (from collective/mass to individualized/personal) must challenge the societal role of PSM, and could undermine its mission for sustaining political, social, and cultural cohesion.

Parallel to this development, and influenced by it, the internal complex factory mode of production is increasingly inappropriate. Gradually leaving the mass production and consumption concept means that high priority is now given to cultivating creative and innovative capabilities. The ability to quickly adapt in order to meet a rising demand for new formats and services becomes a key competence. To meet these new demands, the assemblyline method that remains typical for many PSM companies is threatened with obsolescence, and is already being replaced by a more flexible system characterized by smaller production units within a common, standardized igital network that includes external, independent providers. What are the most likely consequences of these external and internal trends for the management of the PSM media organizations? One possible outcome could be to reverse the centralized managerial control over scheduling of channels, program commissioning, production flows, and cost structures, which, as described, were relevant to a large, factory-like system that prioritized coordination and streamlining in the previous era of mass media. Management modalities in the future will prioritize setting strategic goals, establishing corporate values and standards, and securing the necessary autonomy for decentralized, creative workers that are better suited to a fast-developing, rapidly changing, individualized digital media environment. That is a different world and experience for managers accustomed to tight control over every aspect of highly centralized corporations. Where does one find inspiration and useful advice?

A plea to climb PSM management mountain

I suppose no one will be surprised that I think academia should be able to respond, and that scholars in media management ought to participate in scaling the PSM management mountain. This article is an argument encouraging media management researchers to add PSM as a primary focus of study. This will matter not only "because it is there"—a virtual mountain of interesting questions to be explored with stories worth telling—but also because management studies of PSM will have something unique and valuable to contribute, first, to the wider field of media management scholarship and, beyond that, to the general body of management research. In PSM, one as a unique sample of cases that are reasonably comparable and that may yield important generalizations to enhance understanding about how complex media organizations and their managers react in times of fundamental changes in their environments. Last, but not least, and speaking now on the basis of personal experience "in the trenches" of PSM management, practitioners truly need external inspiration, and they are beginning to look for that from knowledgeable scholars. Those who are able to combine business insight with analytical distance will surely find an eager audience. Because this media sector matters, so will your findings about it.

Вопросы к статье:

1. Что автор понимает под Public Service Media? Какие основные характеристики «общественных медиа» выделяет автор? Насколько Вы согласны с автором в этих критериях? Насколько отличается представление автора о PSM от наших представлений о «социально-значимом контенте»?

2. Какие два противоположных суждения о PSM в академической среде называет автор?
3. Почему с точки зрения автора важно изучать менеджмент общественных медиа?
4. Что именно, по мнению автора, делает специфическим и усложняет менеджмент общественных медиа?
5. Какая, по мнению автора, угроза возникла для общественных медиакомпаний в последние 20 лет?
6. Какие основные исследовательские вопросы в области менеджмента общественных медиакомпаний предлагает автор? И как бы Вы ответили на эти вопросы применительно к России.

Базовая литература для подготовки:

Для подготовки к олимпиаде рекомендуется следующая учебная и иная литература:

- Профиль «Менеджмент в СМИ»

1. Айрис А., Бюген Ж. Управление медиа-компаниями: реализация творческого потенциала. – М.: Издательский дом "Университетская книга": АНО "ШКИМБ", 2010.
2. Вартанова Е.Л. Медиаэкономика зарубежных стран. М.: Аспект-пресс, 2003.
3. Иваницкий В.Л. Основы бизнес-моделирования СМИ / М.: Аспект-пресс, 2010.
4. Интернет в России. Состояние, тенденции и перспективы развития. – М.: ОАО "НИЦ Экономика", 2013.
5. Интернет в России. Состояние, тенденции и перспективы развития. – М.: ОАО "НИЦ Экономика", 2014.
6. Интернет в России. Состояние, тенденции и перспективы развития. – М.: ОАО "НИЦ Экономика", 2015.
7. Кирия И.В. Зарубежный медиамаркетинг. Учебно-методическое пособие, М.: Изд-во «ВК», 2006.
8. Макеенко М.И. Радиовещание и телевидение США в новом столетии: структура, экономика, стратегии. М.: Изд-во МГУ, 2010.
9. Основы медиабизнеса: учебное пособие / Под ред. Вартановой Е.Л. М.: Аспект Пресс, 2009.
10. Российское телевидение: между спросом и предложением / Под ред. Качкаевой А.Г., Кирия И.В., М.: ГУ-ВШЭ, Элиткомстар, 2007.
11. Радиовещание в России в 2012 году. Состояние, тенденции и перспективы развития: Отраслевой доклад / Под ред. О.Я.Ермолаевой, А.В.Шарикова. – М.: Федеральное агентство по печати и массовым коммуникациям Российской Федерации, 2013.
12. Радиовещание в России в 2013 году. Состояние, тенденции и перспективы развития: Отраслевой доклад / Под ред. О.Я.Ермолаевой, А.В.Шарикова. – М.: Федеральное агентство по печати и массовым коммуникациям Российской Федерации, 2014.
13. Радиовещание в России в 2012 году. Состояние, тенденции и перспективы развития: Отраслевой доклад / Под ред. О.Я.Ермолаевой, А.В.Шарикова. – М.: Федеральное агентство по печати и массовым коммуникациям Российской Федерации, 2015.
14. Российская периодическая печать. Состояние, тенденции, перспективы развития: Отраслевой доклад / Под ред. В.В.Григорьева. - М.: Федеральное агентство по печати и массовым коммуникациям Российской Федерации, 2013.
15. Российская периодическая печать. Состояние, тенденции, перспективы развития: Отраслевой доклад / Под ред. В.В.Григорьева. - М.: Федеральное агентство по печати и массовым коммуникациям Российской Федерации, 2014.
16. Российская периодическая печать. Состояние, тенденции, перспективы развития: Отраслевой доклад / Под ред. В.В.Григорьева. - М.: Федеральное агентство по печати и массовым коммуникациям Российской Федерации, 2015.
17. Телевидение в России. Состояние, тенденции, перспективы развития: Отраслевой доклад / Под ред. Е.Л.Вартановой и В.П.Коломийца. – М.: Федеральное агентство по печати и массовым коммуникациям Российской Федерации, 2013. – 100 с.

18. Телевидение в России. Состояние, тенденции, перспективы развития: Отраслевой доклад / Под ред. Е.Л.Вартановой и В.П.Коломийца. – М.: Федеральное агентство по печати и массовым коммуникациям Российской Федерации, 2014. – 92 с.
19. Энциклопедия мировой индустрии СМИ / под ред. Вартановой Е.Л., М.: Аспект-пресс, 2007.
20. Ежегодник «Экономика и менеджмент в СМИ» 2006, 2007, 2008 гг., под ред. Вартановой Е.Л. и Ткачевой Н.В., М.: ВК, Медиамир, 2007-2009.
21. Подборка номеров журнала Journal of Media Business Studies, доступ на сайте http://www.jombs.com/articles.html