

Chapter 14

The Domain of Inquiry for Media Management Researchers

Douglas A. Ferguson

Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH

At a meeting of the Management and Sales division of the Broadcast Education Association (BEA), James Webster (1990) responded to a group of papers on media management with a probing question: How does the study of media management differ from research done by departments of economics or by schools of business administration? Webster stated that there probably was no separate domain for the study of media management. A lively discussion ensued, without much consensus among the participants.

Just as scholars in the interpersonal communication field have wrestled with the questions of domain of inquiry, so too have mass communication researchers. The problem of staking out a separate domain for a specialty area such as media management presents an even greater struggle. This chapter is a first step toward a conceptual domain for the study of media management.

Every field of exploration has three components: a set of scholars, a domain of inquiry, and a methodology (Reinharz, 1982). This chapter focuses on the second component: What is it that makes media management research distinct from the domains of inquiry found in other academic units, such as economics and business administration? What is it that media management researchers do? This task is marked with difficulty. Capella (1987) warned: "Attempts to define whole domains of inquiry are usually doomed to be inaccurate or incomplete. No sooner has the pen been lifted from paper but an uncooperative researcher will have published a new line of inquiry that seems not to fit the newly penned definition" (p. 185). He allowed that the definition of domains of inquiry functions as both detecting and making trends.

COMMUNICATION ANALOGY

Defining the domain of media management is analogous to the larger problem of separating the study of communication into a separate domain

of inquiry. As for almost any specialty area of media research, part of the difficulty for communication in particular lies in the relative youth of the field. Schramm (1963) noted a generation ago that communication was not a discipline like mathematics, but "an academic crossroad where many have passed, but few have tarried" (p. 2). Since then, however, communication has acquired "the trappings of a discipline" (Berger & Chaffee, 1987, p. 15). As the study of the communication has grown—most noticeably in its diversity of journals and institutions—the domain has widened considerably. Qualitative methodologies first developed in Europe are probably responsible for the broadening of the communication discipline (Brown, 1970; Gerbner, 1983; Merton, 1957; Tan, 1986).

Assuming that defining communication is possible, such an activity has been the most common first step toward delineating its domain of inquiry. Krippendorf (1969) defined *communication* as "a process of transmission of structure among the parts of a system which are identifiable in time and space" (p. 107). This accounts for a wide range of emphases: communication as messages, communication as process, and communication as technical facilities. Krippendorf was concerned with what distinguishes inquiries into processes of communication from other fields. He rejected the usual disciplinary differentiations: unique method, specific subject, and narrow purpose. Instead, he emphasized "the *theoretical commitment*" (p. 111, italics in original) to the objects observed.

Definitions are somewhat less complex for a field such as interpersonal communication or mass communication. For one thing, the scope is limited to human communication. Capella (1987) stated that the essential feature of interpersonal communication "is that persons influence one another's behavior over and above that attributed to normal baselines of actions" (p. 228). Mass communication is similar, but with the additional filter of the gatekeeper (Westley & MacLean, 1957; White, 1950). More than any area of mass communication theory, the idea of the gatekeeper is best suited to research on media managers.

Some writers have indicated that the quest for a domain of inquiry for communication research is independent of a given definition of communication. Sayre (1948) asserted that communication is not definable. Fisher (1978) guessed that if one visited any International Communication Association (ICA) or Speech Communication Association (SCA) convention, tripped 10 members at random in the hall, and asked for a definition of *communication*, there would be 10 differing answers. Fisher summarized a diverse range of definitions, including the transmission of symbols model (Shannon & Weaver, 1949) and the idea of "shared meaning" (Gode, 1959). The common property is that communication is a process based on social integration. He concluded that defining communication is "incredibly simple. ... But understanding communication is considerably more complex" (p. 10). Hence, a definition of *communication* ensues from the perspective employed to understand it, not the other way around.

THE NARROW FOCUS ON MEDIA MANAGEMENT

This distinction between knowledge and understanding is important to the domain of media management. Researchers in other disciplines have studied media management as both the dependent and the independent variable, usually the latter. But media management has not been their focus for long. Sociologists and organization communication researchers are more interested in how people behave in groups or cultures. Psychologists study individual behavior. Researchers in business schools seek to understand the managerial process. To do this, some develop models that define the process. Others compile lists of functions that describe the process. The most dedicated find ways to explain the process.

Because of the recent institutionalizing of electronic media study, some researchers feel ill at ease borrowing from economics and business. However, they may be falsely basing the precedence of other fields on ivy-covered buildings. Just as the philosophy of science precedes discipline-specific discussions of theory and methodology, the broader study of communication precedes other fields of human science (Schramm, 1971; Thayer, 1968). Does historical precedence give a given social field squatter's rights to a domain of inquiry? Rather than a media management researcher being concerned with *doing* economics, the economist might just as well be worried about *doing* media management.

This *doing* is the essence of any specialty area's domain of inquiry. The underlying assumption that particular problems must be unique to a field is not new. Devons and Gluckman (1964) proposed that researchers have a duty to follow "a rule of disciplined refusal to trespass on the field of others" (p. 168). However, strict adherence to the rule would have prevented Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967) from crossing over from the psychology department into the domain of communication, with their pragmatic perspective and modified general systems theory. The general systems approach has been adopted recently by media management theorists (Covington, 1994; Sherman, 1987).

Unique theory and a corresponding set of problems present one way to delineate a unique domain for communication research. Despite the withering of effects-oriented domains, such as cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1962) and persuasion (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953), there are several enduring theoretical perspectives under which mass communication researchers labor. The uses and gratifications paradigm (Blumler & Katz, 1974), the agenda-setting function of the media (McCombs & Shaw, 1972), and knowledge gap studies (Tichenor, Donohue, & Olien, 1970) are three examples of domains of inquiry unique to mass communication research.

Media scholars should not suffer the criticisms of older fields of science, such as economics and business. The media industries are too ubiquitous to be unimportant. Neither should researchers in the social science disciplines envy scholars in the hard sciences. Chemistry squandered centuries

of research on alchemy. Medicine was practiced by barbers not so long ago. Even today, physicists cannot decide whether light is a particle or a wave. Indeed, light is a wave *and* a particle, depending on the type of experiment and methodology.

Krippendorff (1969) said, "problems are the sole motivation for inquiries" (p. 112). Regardless of the inquiry, methods are only tools to solve problems. Maslow (1946) argued against means centering, believing that it leads to a hierarchy of sciences and a reification of methodology. The kinds of problems—the domain of inquiry—change over the years, but the development of theory and explanations is constant. Capella (1987) could just as well have been speaking of mass media management when he summed it up this way:

The most accurate and least explicit definition of interpersonal communication as a field of study would be what researchers do and what they allow other researchers to publish under the title of interpersonal communications. On this view, a definition of interpersonal communication will always be incapable of capturing the history and dynamic current affairs that characterize an active and lively scholarly community bridging several disciplines. (p. 185)

WHAT MAKES MEDIA INDUSTRIES DIFFERENT?

The first step in staking out a specialty area such as media management is to enumerate ways in which that area is special to media studies. Lavine and Wackman (1988) identified five factors that differentiate media industries from most manufacturing concerns: (a) the "perishable commodity" nature of the product, (b) the type of employees (e.g., being highly creative and perceiving themselves as members of a profession), (c) the type of organization structure ("flexible, horizontal structure"), (d) the societal role of the media (e.g., high visibility and large influence), and (e) the blurring of lines among the traditional media. The first and third factors are probably the least useful distinctions because other nonmedia businesses deal in perishable commodities and operate with a horizontal structure.

Sherman (1987) linked 10 major components of systems theory to media management. In particular, he noted, "the media are characterized by a high degree of interrelationship and interdependence with other economic, social, political and cultural systems" (p. 41). Based on a careful reading of the few media management textbooks that address theoretical issues, the following list suggests how media industries are different from other kinds of industries.

1. *Media industries are often larger than life.* On the surface, studying media industries is merely analyzing business and finance. Some would argue that one business is much the same as another, with minor differences. Yet Irving Berlin would have had us believe that "there's no business like show business" (*Annie Get*

Your Gun, 1947). Is this necessarily an exaggeration? Is there another area of management and finance connected to as much larger-than-life excitement than that of media industries?

2. *Media industries operate in a fishbowl*. Marcus (1986) postulated an ego variable among media managers that is unmatched in other industries. Most certainly, the decisions (and subsequent successes and failures) of media managers frequently receive greater attention than other types of business, with the possible exception of sports franchises. Media managers are closely identified with a highly visible industry, such that they often become a public extension of that industry. Because the media are continually visible, almost by definition, their managers are closely linked to the media by a wide segment of the public. For example, it is not unusual for the manager of a broadcast station, to take personal any criticism of station policy. In essence, such managers become their own stations.

3. *Media industries lack unique expertise in the eyes of consumers*. Few ordinary citizens pretend to know much about banking, manufacturing, or providing complex services. Yet many who own a television set or read a magazine seem to be experts on the media. This is the price the media pays for being ubiquitous. There is no shortage of people who think they understand the intricacies of the media, and therefore wonder why media managers are sometimes ineffectual. Unless there is a 265-million-barrel oil spill off the coast of Alaska, there are few who would dare to question the management of a company like Exxon. Nevertheless, almost anyone can offer an opinion on the running of mass entertainment companies, such as television networks and motion picture studios.

4. *Media industries manage creativity*. With rare exceptions, mass media managers deal with an unusually free-spirited band of practitioners. Of course, the intangible qualities of a business can haunt managers in any area of endeavor. It is in the mass media industries, however, that nearly all of the employees are producing an intangible product held loosely together by something as nebulous as human creativity. For example, as salespeople, mass media managers are selling the sizzle more often than the steak. Ettema and Whitney (1982) provided many directions for studying the role of creativity in mass media organizations.

5. *Media industries are webs of gatekeeping*. Although the concept of gatekeeping originally described the activities of wire copy editors in the newspaper industry (White, 1950), high-level media managers today are frequently involved with news decisions. Moreover, it is no exaggeration that the media act as a giant filter for all public discourse. Some would argue (e.g., Postman, 1985) that the media even prevent public discourse. As gatekeepers, the media industries are responsible for agenda-managing the public's access to information. Dimmick and Coit (1982) suggested that media decisions are made on many levels, such that the organization acts as a gatekeeper. Whitney (1982) summarized studies in which gatekeeping varied with the different levels of analysis, from individual to institutional.

Such an approach to gatekeeping suggests many research questions for those who would claim the domain of media industry studies. If media systems are hierarchical, then who are the real gatekeepers? How often do the media managers, from the top level, exert control on the free flow of information? This list is far from comprehensive. A few points are certainly debatable. At the very least, most of these alleged differences make inter-

esting research questions. At the most, however, they may point to a theoretical framework for media management.

AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Starting with the idea of gatekeeping, there is a need for a comprehensive model of media management. Such a conceptual framework should embody one or more of the differences exhibited by media industries, as listed earlier. Webster (personal communication, November 29, 1990) suggested that such a framework should include "managing creativity on one hand and managing the audience's consumption of that creative output on the other."

The call to theoretical commitment by Krippendorf (1969) suggests that research into media management should spend more effort on building theory. For example, there is a need for an examination of the exact role of the media manager, beyond that of a gatekeeper. Does the influence of management operate at different levels (e.g., economic, political, social) of the organization?

Future studies of media industries could focus on more critical, and less administrative, aspects of sales and management. Webster (1989) mapped the study of media management under the realm of administrative studies, but called for a commitment to disciplined pluralism of both realms. A robust investigation of the forces at work in media ownership may serve to enhance understanding of media management. Students of media studies would benefit from more attention to broader issues, although not necessarily at the expense of a practical education.

Critical examination of management issues need not be polemic. One approach involves calling into question the various assumptions about how popular media operate. For example, the continued importance of schedule versus menu-based programming should be explored. Jankowski and Fuchs (1995) defended the status quo, but scholars have been slow to weigh in. The opposing viewpoints (e.g., Gilder, 1994) need to be tested by media management researchers.

Another approach is the reexamination of ownership issues. For example, a careful analysis of the underlying issues of merger mania in 1995 and 1996, beyond simple description, is needed. Although there seems to be no shortage of opinion, empirical evidence may be able to shed some light on whether media industries can continue to grow bigger when computer technologies are making independent production more feasible in terms of production and distribution.

Certainly, public policy is one area that has received scant attention from media management scholars. Is the private enterprise model that helped forge powerful American media industries still valid in an international market? Perhaps it is even more valid, but the assumptions about privatization could stand a thorough exploration with regard to different levels of

government support for the media. For example, a research study could contrast the paths of foreign countries' forays into government-blessed private enterprise against recent domestic attempts to auction off additional digital channels to broadcasters for high-definition television.

Finally, more attention to the economics of new media technologies will likely foster media management research in the future. Willis and Willis (1993) commented on the challenges of technology, pointing out future directions for research. If management is dealing with people and money, the challenge may lie in effectively working with smaller staffs and more substantial capital outlays. The case study approach, as applied to media industries outside the United States (e.g., Akhavan-Majid, 1992), should be pursued with American media.

The common attribute shared by all of these approaches is a basic questioning of the way media managers think. The answer to where media management is headed does not necessarily lie in case-specific analysis (e.g., price-fixing at Los Angeles television stations). Researchers can contribute more by looking ahead than by reexamining where management has been in the past or near present.

An important step toward staking out a separate domain of inquiry for media management researchers will be to construct and follow a distinct theoretical framework. The key components of such a framework must address a broad range of perspectives, not just media economics and applied management strategy. Until the scope of research is widened, outside observers may continue to wonder if media management is a sovereign area of study.

REFERENCES

- Akhavan-Majid, R. (1992). Public service broadcasting and the challenge of new technology: A case study of Japan's NHK. *Gazette*, 50(1), 21-36.
- Berger, C. R., & Chaffee, S. H. (Eds.). (1987). The study of communication as a science. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee, *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 15-19). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berlin, I. (1947). *Annie get your gun*. [Piano-vocal score]. New York: Berlin Music Co.
- Brown, R. L. (1970). Approaches to the historical development of mass media studies. In J. Tunstall (Ed.), *Media sociology: A reader* (pp. 41-57). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Capella, J. N. (1987). Interpersonal communication: Definitions and fundamental questions. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 184-238). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Covington, W. C. (1994). *Systems theory applied to the management of television stations in the midst of a multichannel marketplace*. Unpublished dissertation, Bowling Green State University.
- Devons, E., & Gluckman, M. (1964). Conclusion: Modes and consequences of limiting a field of study. In M. Gluckman (Ed.), *Closed systems and open minds: The limits of naivete in social anthropology* (pp. 158-262). Chicago: Aldine.
- Dimmick, J., & Coit, P. (1982). Levels of analysis in mass media decision making: A taxonomy, research strategy, and illustrative data analysis. *Communication Research*, 9, 3-32.
- Ettema, J. S., & Whitney, D. C. (Eds.). (1982). *Individuals in mass media organizations: Creativity and constraint*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Festinger, L. (1962). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fisher, B. A. (1978). *Perspectives on human communication*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gerbner, G. (1983). Ferment in the field [Special issue]. *Journal of Communication*, 33(3).
- Gilder, G. F. (1994). *Life after television* (Rev. ed.). New York: Norton.
- Gode, A. (1959). What is communication? *Journal of Communication*, 9, 5.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jankowski, G. F., & Fuchs, D. C. (1995). *Television today and tomorrow*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (1969). Values, modes, and domains of inquiry into communication. *Journal of Communication*, 19(2), 105–133.
- Lavine, J. M., & Wackman, D. B. (1988). *Managing media organizations*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Marcus, N. (1986). *Broadcast and cable management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Maslow, A. H. (1946). Problem-centering vs. means-centering in science. *Philosophy of Science*, 13, 326–331.
- McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176–187.
- Merton, R. K. (Ed.). (1957). The sociology of knowledge and mass communications. In R. K. Merton (Ed.), *Social theory and social structure* (Rev. ed., pp. 439–455). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*. New York: Viking.
- Reinharz, S. (1982, August). *The future of feminist psychology*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Sayre, W. W. (1948). Communication as a first principle in philosophy. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 34, 128–136.
- Schramm, W. L. (1963). *The science of human communication*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schramm, W. L. (1971). Nature of communication between humans. In W. L. Schramm & D. F. Roberts (Eds.), *The process and effects of mass communication* (pp. 3–53). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Shannon, C. E., & Weaver, W. (1949). *The mathematical theory of communication*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Sherman, B. L. (1987). *Telecommunications management: The broadcast & cable industries*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tan, C. Z. (1986, August). *Ferment in the field revisited: Its basis and future*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Norman, OK.
- Thayer, L. (1968). Communication: *Sine qua non* of the behavioral sciences. In D. L. Arm (Ed.), *Journeys in science; single steps, great strides* (pp. 48–77). Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Tichenor, P. J., Donohue, G. A., & Olien, C. N. (1970). Mass media flow and differential growth in knowledge. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 34, 159–170.
- Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication*. New York: Norton.
- Webster, J. (1989). Media study in a time of technological change. *Feedback*, 30(3), 20–24.
- Webster, J. (1990, February). *Response to papers*. Remarks presented at the meeting of the Broadcast Association, Las Vegas.
- Westley, B. H., & MacLean, M. (1957). A conceptual model for communication research. *Journalism Quarterly*, 34, 31–38.
- White, D. (1950). The “gate keeper”: A case study in the selection of news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 27, 283–290.
- Whitney, D. C. (1982). Mass communicator studies: Similarity, difference, and level of analysis. In J. S. Ettema & D. C. Whitney (Eds.), *Individuals in mass media organizations: Creativity and constraint* (pp. 241–254). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Willis, J., & Willis, D. B. (1993). *New directions in media management*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.